DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 766 EA 017 236

AUTHOR	Marshner, Connaught, Ed.
TITLE	A Blueprint for Education Reform.
INSTITUTION	Free Congress Research and Education Foundation, Washington, DC. Child and Family Protection Inst.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-89526-823-X
PUB DATE	84
NOTE	306p.; For individual chapters, see EA 017 237-248.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publication Sales, Free Congress Research and Educatoin Foundation, 721 Second Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20002 ($14.00).
PUB TYPE	Books (010) -- Collected Works - General (020) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Black Education; Citizenship Education; Discipline; *Educational Change; Educational Experience; *Educational Improvement; Educational Vouchers; Elementary Secondary Education; Home Schooling; Parent Influence; Parent Rights; Political Influences; Political Socialization; Private Education; *Public Education; School Choice; School Effectiveness; School Entrance Age; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	Pluralism

ABSTRACT

In a continuation of the national debate over education reform, the 14 contributors to this book outline several approaches to reform, address a variety of current education issues, and relate parent and teacher perspectives on education. An overview by President Ronald Reagan of education reform issues is provided, followed by chapters on the importance of parental rights in schooling and the need to bring pluralism to public education through the parents' right of school choice and the elimination of majority control of school policy. Other chapters discuss the lack of classroom discipline, the need for teacher training reform, the politicization of the classroom by means of the curriculum and by teachers, the need to revitalize citizenship education, the conclusions of effective schools research, the case for a federal voucher program, issues in the educational progress of black people, the advantages of home education and delayed schooling, the grassroots parent-based effort to reform public education, and the life experiences and observations of a teacher. (DCS)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

ED250766

A Blueprint For Education Reform

Edited By

Connaught Marshner

EA 017 236

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Connaught Marshner
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Free Congress Research & Education Foundation

A
Blueprint
For
Education Reform

Edited by
Connaught Marshner

Regnery/Gateway
FREE CONGRESS RESEARCH AND EDUCATION
FOUNDATION

Copyright © 1984 by the Free Congress Research and Education Foundation.
All rights reserved. Manufactured in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Catalogue Number: 84-61475
International Standard Book Number: 0-89526-823-X

Published by Regnery Gateway, Inc.
360 West Superior Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610-0890

The Child and Family Protection Institute's major areas of concern are trends affecting the stability and well-being of American family life and analysis of public policy as it impacts the family.

The American Education Coalition, a project of the Child and Family Protection Institute, is an organization helping parents improve the public schools.

At a time in which there is great discussion of all aspects of society and the family, the Institute seeks to give balance to the debate by presenting the enduring and traditional alternative to the modern reader. The Institute affirms the centrality of the family in American society at present and in the future.

The Free Congress Research and Education Foundation is a 501 (c) (3) tax exempt research organization, engaged in a variety of educational projects. The Free Congress Research and Education Foundation is located at 721 Second Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002.

None of the statements made in this book should be construed as the policy views of the Free Congress Research and Education Foundation or its Board of Directors.

The Free Congress Research and Education Foundation

Officers of the Board
Kathleen Teague, Chairman
Dr. Charles Moser, Treasurer
Margaret Johnson, Secretary
Dr. Robert J. Billings
Senator William Armstrong
William Marshner
Michelle Laxalt

Foundation Staff
Paul M. Weyrich, President
Connaught Marshner, Director, Child and Family Protection Institute, Editor Family Protection Report

CONTENTS

Preface / *v*

Overview of Education Reform Issues
Ronald Reagan / 1

Part One: Philosophical Fundaments

Chapter 1
Parental Rights in Schooling, *William Bentley Ball / 11*

Chapter 2
Pluralism, Equal Liberty, and Public Education,
Stephen Arons / 39

Part Two: Issues of the Day

Chapter 3
Discipline in the Classroom, *Roger Clegg / 59*

Chapter 4
The Training of Teachers: A Dubious Record,
James W. LoGerfo / 75

Chapter 5
The Politicization of the Classroom, *Marcella D. Hadeed / 111*

Chapter 6
Citizenship Education: Recovering a Lost Dimension,
Linda Chavez / 131

Chapter 7
Looking at Some Research on What Makes an Effective
School, *Thomas R. Ascik / 141*

Chapter 8
Robin Hood Goes To School: The Case for a Federal Voucher
Program, *Lawrence A. Uzzell / 167*

Chapter 9
Issues in the Educational Progress of Black People, *Benjamin H. Alexander with Preston M. Royster / 191*

Chapter 10
The Cradle and the Gap, *Raymond S. Moore / 231*

Part Three: The Personal Perspective

Chapter 11
The Parents Movement: Grassroots Origins, *Marcia Sielaff / 251*

Chapter 12
One Teacher's Opinion, *Thomas J. Donovan / 275*

Contributors / *299*

Preface

WITH HUMILITY AND HOPE, the Child and Family Protection Institute of the Free Congress Research and Education Foundation offers *A Blueprint for Education Reform*—humility because so many others are making so many contributions to the national debate over education reform, hope because we believe that American education *can* be reformed. That our nation needs education reform is manifest. How that reform is accomplished, or not accomplished, will determine how our nation survives in the 21st century. It is not a matter of preference; it is a matter of necessity.

The contributers to *A Blueprint for Education Reform* represent different paths of life: lawyers, scholars, parents, businessmen. Only one is a practicing classroom teacher, though several are qualified to be. That fact in itself tells a great deal about the genesis of the problems in the education system: the "education establishment" has postured itself so frequently as part of the problem that solutions must be sought elsewhere.

Each author's chapter represents his or her own views and not necessarily those of the individuals or organizations with which they are affiliated. In addition, none of the specific recommendations made here should be construed as necessarily representing the policy views of the Free Congress Research and Education Foundation, which sponsored this book, or its Board of Directors.

This book was a long time from conception to delivery, and thanks must be given to all who were inconvenienced by the delay, chiefly those on the staff of the Child and Family Protection Institute. Martie Lawrence, Joseph Piccione, and Patrick Fagan bore the brunt of the extra work. Eric Licht, Vice-President for Operations at the Free Congress Foundation, went many extra miles. The help of Larry Uzzell, Gary Bauer, and Patrick McGuigan in the original conceptualizing was invaluable.

Clyde Peters of Regnery Gateway was most helpful in pushing schedules to the limit. Special thanks of course are in order to Paul Weyrich, President of the Free Congress Foundation, who first envisioned *A Blueprint for Education Reform* and then made it possible to become a reality, and to Alyce Spurlock and William Marshner, who made it a reality in the practical terms of the editor's life.

Problems with the book—inadequacies or shortcomings, that may be found in it,—are entirely the editor's responsibility.

August 15, 1984
Connaught Marshner
Washington, D.C.

8

Overview of Education Reform Issues

Ronald Reagan

It's hardly customary for a contributing author in one book to plug another. But this is an unusual issue and we're in an unusual time.

I nominate for "must" reading, of all things, a government publication. "Must" reading for educators, Federal and State legislators, Federal and State employees and—most importantly—parents. It's the May, 1984, report on the progress we made in the first year since the National Commission on Excellence in Education issued its report on the quality of our educational system. It is called *The Nation Responds: Recent Efforts to Improve Education.*

Remember the Commission's report in the headlines? It was titled: *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform.* And indeed, we were "at risk"—and still are.

The Commission's report was a best-seller—more than half a million original editions and copies were printed. As well it should be a bestseller. "At risk," after all, is about one of the fundamental building blocks of the American society—our public and private education system. Millions more of us have seen, heard and thought about all or some of that report—in news stories, Congressional reprints, excerpts in our leading news media, and in conferences, seminars and workshops examining what it had to say about the quality of education in our land.

What the Commission had to say was not good news. Those of us who really care about education in America probably knew just how bad the Commission's news was going to be. Still, it was a shock to most of us to have it appear in cold print.

- From 1963 to 1981, a period of unprecedented "onward and upward" spending in elementary and secondary education, there was an unbroken decline in scholastic aptitude test scores.
- In that same period, science achievement scores of 17-year-olds suffered a steady decline.
- And most shocking of all, more than one-tenth of our 17-year-olds—the juniors and seniors of our high schools—were functionally illiterate.

The litany of bad news went on and on in the Commission report—rampant disciplinary problems, declining parental involvement, de-emphasis of the basic core subjects and disenchantment with the entire educational process on the part of teachers, students and parents alike.

But what *The Nation Responds*, published just one year after the sobering Commission report, has to say *is* good news. It reveals much about the spirit of our Nation when challenged by an issue that touches its very core. I think it says that we're living in the most exciting time in American education since the concept of public schools was "invented" on our shores nearly 200 years ago when Massachusetts enacted the very first comprehensive state school law.

If I were asked to single out the proudest achievements of my Administration's first three and one-half years in office, what we've done to define the issues and promote the great national debate in education would rank right up near the top of the list, right along with what we've done on taxes and spending, inflation, and the health of our economy and, most important of all, the rebirth of our sense of energy and freedom

Nowhere can our rebirth of confidence and hope play a larger, more vital role than in our approach to education.

Just as schools were in a decline during the past two decades, today they're taking stock and playing their part in our great sense of national renewal. That's as it should and must be.

Since our Administration put education at the top of the American agenda we've seen a grassroots revolution that promises to strengthen every school in the country, based not on more Federal spending and interference, but on State and local reform. From Maine to California, parents, teachers, school Administrators, and State and local officeholders have begun vital work to improve the fundamentals, not fancy budget structures, not frills in the curriculum, but basic teaching and learning. As Secretary of Education Terrel Bell observed: "There is currently in progress the greatest, most far-reaching, most promising reform and renewal of education we have seen since the turn of the century."

When our administration took office only a handful of States had task forces on education. Today they all do. In addition, 44 States are increasing graduation requirements, 42 are studying improvements in teacher certification, and 13 are establishing master teacher programs. With school reform, as with so many other challenges again and again in our nation's history, the American people are showing it can be done.

We've traveled far in improving our schools, but I don't believe there's one concerned parent or educator who would conclude that our job is over.

Some insist there's only one way to reform education—more Federal money. But that's been tried. Total expenditures in our nation's schools this year, according to the National Center for Education Statistics, will total $230 billion. That's up almost 7 percent from last year, about double the rate of inflation, and more than double what we spent on education just 10 years ago.

If money alone were the answer, the problem would have long ago been solved. Those who constantly call for more money are the same people who presided over the decades of unbroken education decline.

James Coleman, a top education expert, argues in his important book, *High School Achievement*, that we need to focus on the factors that truly matter. He states, "Characteristics of schools [that] are related to achievement can be divided into two areas: academic demands and discipline."

I think he's right.

As for academic demands, it's clear that we must expect more from our students. Our children need to do more work and better work, and that includes homework. Indeed, in her well-known study, Barbara Lerner found that the amount of homework assigned in a school is the single most reliable predictor of how well the students in that school will perform on national tests.

Now, none of this is a prescription for gloomy students. We've learned that when students know that their parents and teachers have confidence in their abilities the students gain self-esteem, enjoy their work, and live up to those high expectations.

We must also require that our students learn the basics. Stories abound of students who leave school unable to read and write at an adult level. In 1980, 35 States required only 1 year of math for a high school diploma; 36 required only 1 year of science.

Today, as *The Nation Responds* report points out, that sad state of affairs is being turned around.

Compare what was the case here in 1980 to other industrialized countries. In Japan, specialized study in mathematics, biology and physics begin in the sixth grade. In the Soviet Union, students learn the basic concepts of algebra and geometry in elementary school. So it's not surprising that Japan, with a population only about half the size of ours, graduates from college more engineers than we do, while the Soviet Union graduates almost five times more engineering specialists than does America.

As for discipline, the second of James Coleman's "musts," it should be obvious that no learning can take place without good order in the classroom, and that means restoring good old-fashioned discipline. In too many schools, teachers lack the authority necessary to make students take tests, hand in homework, or even quiet the class. And in too many schools, teachers suffer verbal and even physical abuse.

According to a 1978 report by the National Institute of Education, each month over 2 million secondary school children were victims of in-school crime. Not ordinary high jinks—crime. In 1981, during a 5-month period in California, there were at least 100,000 incidents of violence. A study of Boston high schools showed that during 1982 more than one-sixth of female students and more than one-third of male students carried weapons to school. A 1983 survey of Michigan schools shows that one in five Michigan teachers has been struck by a student.

As long as one teacher is assaulted, one classroom is disrupted, or one student is attacked, then I must and will speak out to give our educators the support they need to enforce discipline in our schools. For too long, courts and others have concentrated too narrowly on protecting the rights of the disruptive few. Well, it's time we also paid some attention to the rights of the well-behaved students who want to learn and the good teachers who want to teach.

I can't say it too forcefully: To get learning back into our schools, we must get crime and violence out.

I'm not talking about establishing order only in our classrooms and hallways, but in our students' hearts and minds. We're training our children for life in a democracy, so we must provide not only classroom discipline, but we must teach self-discipline as well. If it's sometimes difficult to assert rightful adult authority, we must ask: "Who should correct the child's arithmetic? His math teacher? Or years later, his boss? Who should teach the child respect for rules? His principal? Or some day, law officers?"

We must teach our sons and daughters a proper respect for academic standards, for codes of civilized behavior, and for knowledge itself—not for the sake of those standards, not for the sake of those codes, not even for the sake of that knowledge, but for the sake of those young lives.

To promote good order in our schools, the Department of Education is studying ways to combat school violence, and the Department is continuing its joint project with the National Institute of Justice to find better ways for localities to use their resources to prevent school crime.

The Department of Justice has established a National School Safety Center to inform teachers and other officials of their legal rights and to provide a computerized national clearinghouse for school safety resources. In addition, the Department of Justice will file friend-of-the-court briefs in appropriate cases to support the rights of school administrators to enforce discipline.

The Federal Government can support these and other reforms without recycling still more tax dollars or imposing still more regulations. Our Administration is doing just that. We're working to restore our nation's parents, State and local officials, teachers, school administrators, and principals to their rightful place in the educational process.

The primary right, duty and responsibility for educating children belongs to parents. Their wishes should be heeded. In order to accomplish this we have developed initiatives that provide families with greater control over decisions in the education of their children. For example, we have proposed tuition tax credits which would grant parents of private school children a tax credit of as much as $300 per year (families with incomes over $60,000 per year could not qualify for the credit).

Tuition tax credits are student assistance, not institutional aid. They would correct a condition which currently provides little choice for parents.

By enhancing parental choice in education, tuition tax credits will stimulate competition, and healthy competition will serve to improve the quality of our schools. Good public schools have nothing to fear if tuition tax credits are provided for private school parents because these schools are now providing students with a quality education. On the other hand, inferior public schools will be forced to improve or lose students to superior institutions. All students would benefit from the availability of tuition tax credits. Public school teachers and administrators will be encouraged to respond to these students' needs and to their parent's wishes.

Tuition tax credits would especially benefit those inner city students who currently have no effective choice. Many low-income parents would exercise their right to choose and send their children to the school offering the best possible educational opportunity. Since many parents have 2 or 3 children in school, a tuition tax credit would be of enormous help.

My Administration has also proposed assisting low income families by supporting legislation allowing the states to use their Chapter I funds as vouchers for eligible children rather than directing aid to those schools. At $2.7 billion per year, Chapter I funds reach 89% of the nation's school districts. Some 5.2 million children are expected to participate in Chapter I programs in 1984, and that is more than 11% of our elementary and secondary students. Chapter I funds currently go to public agencies. By redirecting these funds to the disadvantaged individuals themselves, we would be consistent with the federal post-secondary education policy, which is designed to help students rather than institutions. A Chapter I voucher would be worth approximately $500, and a recent Gallup Poll clearly demonstrates that a majority of the American public favors this approach.

Tuition tax credits and vouchers on a national scale represent an idea where time has indeed come. Parents would be much more involved in deciding what type of education they want for their children. They would be more inclined to work together with local school principals and boards of education and this would strengthen the local control of schools and assure that children receive an education which supports the values being taught at home.

Teacher quality is improved when some form of merit pay is installed. While opponents constantly call for large, across-the-board raises as the only solution to our educational crisis, I am calling for performance-based incentives pay. Excellent teaching must be rewarded.

The single salary schedule for teachers is not working. In other professions, earnings increase according to job performance. The American public school teacher is locked into a single salary schedule where compensation is determined by longevity and completion of additional college or graduate school level courses. Across-the-board raises that are not accompanied by career ladders or other performance-based financial incentives will drain the coffers of the states without providing incentives for teachers to remain in the classroom and perform to the full extent of their abilities.

Performance-based pay for teachers, rewarding excellence in instruction, is supported by 80% of the American public according to a recent Gallup poll. Moreover, a survey by *The American School Board Journal* indicated that nearly two-thirds of America's teachers (union and non-union) felt their raises should be based upon their teaching performance. Not only would performance-based pay attract and retain the best possible teachers, but the performance of all teachers would improve as well. It's common sense that, when performance is measured, performance tends to improve.

One of our highest priorities is enlisting the aid of the private sector to help our schools. I signed a proclamation that named the 1983-84 school year the National Year of Partnerships in Education. The proclamation urged businesses, labor unions, and other groups in the private sector to form partnerships with schools in their communities.

Since then, partnerships in education have increased around the country dramatically. This is an idea with much merit. The impact of private sector involvement in our schools has been nothing short of phenomenal. This effort, as well as the President's Academic Fitness Awards designed to recognize outstanding students, has been enormously successful and well received.

As we strive for academic excellence and to teach our children the fundamental values we hold so dear, we dare not forget that our civilization was built by men and women who placed their faith in a loving God. If the Congress can begin each day with a moment of prayer and meditation, so then can our sons and daughters in our schools.

That is why we proposed and fought for a constitutional amendment to lift the ban on school prayer. It is ironic and sad that, while the courts have been more than willing to stand up for the right of free speech by groups such as Nazis and the KKK, they fail to support voluntary religious expression of speech. Despite the overwhelming support of the American public for voluntary prayer in our schools, we were not successful in gaining approval in the U.S. Senate this year. However, I am pleased that the Senate voted overwhelmingly in June to allow student religious groups the same rights as other organizations to meet on public school grounds. At this writing, the "equal access" issue is pending in the U.S. House of Representatives. I am firmly committed to seeing that all of our children have every opportunity to strengthen their religious and moral values.

The school prayer issue is part of a broader issue, one which goes to the very heart of our heritage as Americans: the need to regain in our schools a respect for the basic moral values on which America was built. The traditional values of this nation must not be censored from our public schools. The same moral values that made us a great nation still need to be taught, understood and appreciated as part of the educational process for our young people. After all, education and learning, like success and power, have only relative value—they must first be grounded in the higher values of right and morality if they are to have any meaning at all. To divorce education from such values, as if there were no longer any need to recognize right and wrong, is to impoverish the spirit of our youth.

Another area much in need of reform is teacher certification. Many bright young people have been deterred from pursuing a career in teaching because of the requirement making "methods" courses (teacher education courses) mandatory at the expense of substantive courses in math, science, and history.

Governor Thomas H. Kean of New Jersey has made a recommendation that I hope will receive wide support. He has suggested that the New Jersey State Board of Education authorize a waiver of the teacher certification requirements. This would be done by allowing applicants who are successful mathematicians, scientists, linguists and journalists the opportunity to pass a competency test in an appropriate subject area, thereby qualifying to spend a year as a paid teaching intern. At the end of that period of time, a permanent certificate would be issued if the individual performed satisfactorily.

The New Jersey Department of Education, like other states, receives hundreds of applications from persons who have not taken teacher education training, yet who appear to be highly qualified to teach in the public schools. If this proposal is accepted, it would increase the pool of qualified candidates by permitting school districts the opportunity to select their teachers by identifying the best candidates through a local screening process.

Despite the importance of these initiatives at the national level, the main responsibility for education rests with our States and communities, and they're moving forward. State by State, the success stories abound.

Indiana, for example, has increased high school graduation requirements and has initiated a basic skills program for early grades. Iowa is putting together a program of incentives for students who take upper-level math and science courses. Tennessee and Florida, to name but two, have begun work on pay incentives for instructors because they realize the necessity of rewarding good teaching.

At the local level parents have begun to give schools new support in ways that range from helping out on field trips to raising money for special projects. Throughout our nation, school boards have begun to write stricter discipline codes and rewrite curriculums to stress the basics. In community after community, principals, teachers and parents, are turning schools around.

Yes, indeed we are a "nation at risk." But the risk is lessening, we're turning things around. America is on the move again and at the heart of this change is an education reform. A grassroots movement of concerned citizens has emerged.

Let's not look back; there's more to do. The challenge is being met. We must and we will continue pursuing excellence.

ONE

Parental Rights in Schooling

William Bentley Ball

THE PARENTAL RIGHT

"Parental rights" is a broad topic indeed, within which are encompassed many sub-topics. The "parental rights" involved in the Baby Jane Doe case may be different from those of Amish parents in the *Yoder*[1] case. Has the parent whose nights are spent before the tavern TV the same rights as the parent who nurtures the gift which is a child? "Family rights"—a term of some currency—has many meanings, too, one of these implying rights in children as co-governors of the family. This chapter will touch upon "family rights" and the sometimes implied "child rights" but only as part of its single focus: protection of parents, as the people solely entitled to provide for the *education* of their children.

"Solely entitled": is not society both originally and ultimately responsible to assure that the child is educated, with the parent allowed a fairly wide range of choices within a broad prescription by the state? For two reasons—one negative, one positive: no. The negative reason is that, once we say that the parental right is a species of societal right, we have made the parent an agent of the state, and the parental "right" a mere revocable, constantly qualifiable, privilege. The positive reason brings to the fore one of those propositions—not unlike the abortion question—upon which citizens seem savagely divided: that, by virtue of parentage, one's child is one's own, to nurture and to guide.

Directly impinging upon the question of parental rights in education is the overall issue of subsidiarity, or the principle that government should not undertake to perform those works which individuals or voluntary associations can accomplish through their own initiative and industry. That is obviously a self-evident principle of freedom within a society and will be rejected only by those who conceive that freedom is not to be preferred to the "security" supposedly afforded by governmental patternizing of all people.

Some see the parental right in education as absolute. Others see it, in the civil order, as a right parallel to the right of other bodies to educate.[2] Some churches, for example, view their schools as mere surrogates of parents. And most state educational bureaucracies in America view the state as not merely a superior educator but as the sole educator. Powerful groups advocate that view, while there are some who concede no role whatever to the state in respect to the educating of children. Some churches which operate schools conceive that the church has a fundamental right to educate.[3] It can be said that, predominantly, America's religious schools emphasize the right of parents to educate, against the assumption that it is the state which shall define, prescribe and enforce education.

But does not that view give sanction to child abuse or child slavery? Indeed, does it not actually encourage ignorance, third-rate education, shoddy schools? And therefore does this not threaten an absence, in the coming generations, of knowledge of the democratic society and of the citizen's proper functioning within it? Such questions are often posed in the American court cases now widely testing the parental right. It is well that they are, since they at once put into issue the interesting matter of what *is* happening to children in those schools which the state totally funds and totally governs. At this point, however, it suffices to answer that there exists, of course, the ultimate power in us all, as a society, to utilize the law to restrain great and manifest evil. The law may be invoked to prevent grave, actual abuses of their children by parents. Discussed later herein, this power is extremely limited in scope. There plainly exists, however, another aspect of state power, to which reference is rarely made: the state's protective function. As one scholar has well stated it:

> The state's first and most basic function in education is to so dispose of and regulate the factors operating in society that the primary educators may do the work God and nature itself have assigned to them.[4]

In the text "primary educators" referred to church and parent; their *freedom* to educate must be protected.

The "primary" parental right: is it also a plenary right? What, in other words, of child rights? I am aware that there exists (nay, thrives) a well organized movement which pressures legislatures, governmental agencies, and courts to center upon the child a weaponry of rights which either he may assert or which may be asserted on his behalf by a force outside the family—namely, government. "Child rights" become essentially government rights. And just as in the field of education there is a school of thought which holds government to be the superior educator, so in the field of child care there has emerged the view that government is the superior parent.[5]

Private education in America today consists of education provided by schools and of non-school education being provided by families. A large majority of the private schools are religious, and, although national statistics on home education are not available[6], some—perhaps much—of that education is also religious in motivation and content. The religious bodies operating schools appear to agree that the right of parents to determine the education of their children is primary—antecedent to rights of society. Unhappily, in practice the right has not always been rendered clear by religious organizations.

This ambiguity is doubtless due to the fact that, over the past few decades, those larger churches which operate schools either have desired to accommodate state demands, or have not perceived state demands as trespassing upon their liberties[7], or have not actually encountered any jarring intrusions by the state. Further, in many of those instances where private schools have become involved in litigation with the state, parents have not been parties. The schools or churches have sometimes spoken for them, or have ignored their existence, or the parents have expressed no knowledge of, or interest in, their rights, or the judges have ignored their presence.[8]

Three situations today, however, bring issues of parental rights in the U.S.A. to the fore, and may force our courts and legislatures to come to grips with them in ways they may not previously have done. But these situations must also press schools, churches and parents themselves to better define parental rights in education—and to better protect them. The three situations are: (a) the widespread denial of intellectual, moral and religious liberty in public education, (b) the growing efforts of state education bureaucracies to supervise education and (c) the growth of the home education movement. This chapter deals with (a) and (b).

THE SITUATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Establishing of Secularism (1947-1963)

Doubtless the great majority of parents whose children are enrolled in public schools find little if anything objectionable in the schools in terms of intellectual liberty, morality or religion. To a great extent the American public school today at once reflects—while it also complements, or indeed helps form—the outlook of the community in which it exists. And that outlook is also formed by views and attitudes presented through media which now pervade—with predictable and sometimes automatic results—the dwelling place of virtually every human being in the land. Those views and attitudes are in turn those of the individuals who write the news, the entertainment formats and scenarios, the spoken and written editorials, obvious or concealed. Those views and attitudes have been carefully identified by Lichter and Rothman in their study, "Media and Business Elites".[9]

Therefore we must accept the fact that most parents having children in public schools have no objection, for example, to secular humanist values expounded throughout the curriculum or to sex education programs which may assume or even promote unchastity. They have no objection to the shut-out of religion and often not to the allowance of dishonesty, slovenliness, or even violence. This is not to say that public schools in all communities have these characteristics; it is merely to say that the widespread existence of such traits has quite evidently not occasioned a popular parental revolt. But even though a thousand public school parents may testify that they are good, patriotic, or even religious, citizens and that they find nothing objectionable in their public school, the objection of a single parent who *does* conscientiously object must not be deemed foreclosed. In testing a civil right, the questions are *not*: "What does the majority think? What is the consensus?" If these indicate the constitutional standard, then movie censorship laws, racially oppressive laws and no end of other laws adopted by elected representatives of the people, which have been held by the courts to suppress rights of minorities, or even of individuals—would remain today on the books and enforceable.

It becomes important at this point to know what the Supreme Court of the United States has held with respect to the liberties of parents of public school children. The Court has been praised for its series of decisions, starting with the *McCollum* case in 1948[10] relating to parental rights. These decisions were responsive to suits brought by parents[11] to rid the public schools of theistic religious practices. They were thus decisions favoring *some* parents. They in fact denied parental rights of many other parents. The unfortunate effect of these decisions today is not merely one of deprivation of religious, moral and intellectual liberties for many parents, but of opening the door to actual and intolerable impositions of values and attitudes upon the minds of their children.

McCollum, and its two successor decisions, *Engel*[12] and

Schempp[13], presented the nation with constitutional inventing[14]—borrowed, one must add, from the guiding briefs of national organizations which appeared to be the true parties in interest in these test cases.[15] More important to the present inquiry are the principles developed by the Supreme Court in those cases in respect to parental rights in education.

McCollum represents a devastating and historic blow to parental liberties—and to community consensus, pluralism and religious liberty. In the year the case was started, the School District of Champaign, Illinois, had, with great labor, brought into being a plan which it deemed to be a beneficent device for the accommodation, within the public schools, of the religious liberty of children (and relatedly of their parents). Heedless that it might be taking a first step toward rendering the public schools, not religiously "neutral", but religiously secularist, the Court voided the plan. The plan was the product of deliberations by a council made up of interested Jews, Catholics and Protestants. Under the plan, the local board of education permitted weekly classes in religious instruction to take place on public school premises in grades four through nine. No child was required to participate. No expense to the School District was involved, the instructors being the employees of the interreligious council. The parent initiated the child's participation through signing a card requesting the instruction. The instructors were subject to approval by the superintendent of schools, this apparently to insure that persons promising harm to children or disruption of the regimen of the school could be kept out. The evidence established that this provision had never been employed to deny access to any religion's representative. It was further found by the trial court that the religious education classes (with which, by the time of trial, there had been five years experience) had not been promotive of sectarian differences, but had in effect "fostered tolerance rather than intolerance." As against the acceptance and support of the program by a majority of the parents, one parent, Mrs. Vashti McCollum, who described herself as a "rationalist", sought to end the program. In the Supreme Court she prevailed.[16] The bases for the Court's decision become interesting to reexamine in 1984, when the cumulative effect of decades of parental frustration over denial of religious liberty for children in public schools has apparently reached an explosive pitch.

The Court's opinion (by Justice Black) was erected upon the sands of Justice Black's *Everson* opinion—his imaginative (and historically inaccurate) picture of the meaning of the Establishment Clause. The Court's point was that the use made of "tax-supported property for religious instruction and the close cooperation between the school authorities and the religious council" violated the principle of absolute church-state separation. The Court ignored all facts contained in the trial record which showed how salutary the program was in accommodating the liberties of students and parents, or how the program offended no one except the pressure groups which had conveyed Mrs. McCollum to her victory. While the lady's interest in obliterating the program appeared to be less that of a parent than that of a "rationalist", the interests of all the other parents did not intrude upon the Court's thinking. Not once in the opinion of the Court appears a single line devoted to *their* equities. Justice Felix Frankfurter penned a long concurrence likewise expressing no concern for them, but going on to say how children who did not participate in the program would be harmed. Evidence of those dreadful consequences, however, was nowhere to be found in the record. No parent or child, victimized by the program, had given evidence at the trial of any trauma the program caused. The harm was indeed of a more incorporeal sort: harm to a "*principle*"—*i.e.*, to a narrow philosophic prejudice insistent that *its* values be imposed as superior to any parental rights.

Thus the Court destroyed a socially valuable community agreement which, over the years, had been painstakingly developed. An important value of the program lay in its encouraging religious pluralism—a value later said in Court opinions to be important.[17] The greater damage, however, was the damage to the proper interests of religious parents; furthermore the Court had now set the stage for the total establishment of secularism in the public schools which would be accomplished fifteen years later.

Engel v. Vitale was an action by the parents of public school pupils to bar use, in their school, of a prayer[18] composed by a governmental body, the New York Board of Regents. The prayer was to be recited aloud; no pupil was to be compelled to participate if his parents objected. School authorities were forbidden to comment upon non-participation of any student, students being permitted to remain silent or to be excused entirely from the exercise. The parents who sued included "members of the Jewish faith, of the Society For Ethical Culture, of the Unitarian Church, and one non-believer." They claimed that the prayer practice violated the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment. After the case was underway other parents intervened, claiming that to ban the practice violated rights of theirs protected by the Free Exercise Clause of the same amendment. The Supreme Court held the program to be void as an establishment of religion, and what is remarkable about its opinion is its reliance upon irrelevant history and its complete failure even to mention the asserted parental rights of the intervening parents. The historical props by which the Court, in lengthy footnotes, sought to support its opinion ranged from the Inquisition through the depredations upon religion of Mary Tudor and Elizabeth I, the persecutions of John Bunyan and Roger Williams and the Virginia assessments against which Madison had inveighed. The Court summarized its key point: ". . . the historical fact that governmentally established religions and religious persecution go hand in hand." In other words, the 24-word prayer—in spite of the procedural safeguards which had been attached to its use—set the stage for religious persecution in New York. In fact there existed no credible connection whatever between the prayer program and the dreadful historical episodes with which the footnotes were threaded. And this scholarly-looking hyperbole sufficed to render any discussion of the parental rights of the interveners unnecessary. Thus was ignored a wise earlier admonition of the New York Court of Appeals (which had upheld the prayer program). It had quoted a statement of a Mr. Spencer, the State Superintendent of Schools in 1839:

> *Both* parties have rights; the one to bring up their children in the practice of publicly thanking the Creator for his protection and invoking his blessing; the other of declining on behalf of their children, the religious services of any person in whose creed they may not concur, or for other reasons satisfactory to themselves.[19]

The Regents Prayer Case caused a national storm of criticism—characterized by Paul Freund of Harvard Law School as a mere "intemperate outburst" but in fact expressing a widespread and profound anxiety over the ultimate significance of the decision. The Supreme Court, with but one dissent (that of Justice Stewart), had banned the prayer because it was religious. The Court's words were:

> ...the State of New York has adopted a practice wholly inconsistent with the Establishment Clause. There can, of course, be no doubt that New York's program of daily invocation of God's blessings as prescribed in the Regents' prayer is a *religious activity.*[20]

The country read the matter rightly. "Religious activity"—*any* religious activity—was now purged from the schools which most children attend. There followed, next term, a third in the trilogy of cases relating to religion in the public schools—and hence vitally affecting parental rights in education. The Supreme Court's decision in that case has been propagandized as an historic balancing of interests in religious liberty as against the public interest in nonestablishment of religion in the schools. It is nothing of the sort. Rather it was an elaborate attempt of the Court to defuse the intense controversy which followed its *Engel* decision. The case, *Abington Township School District v. Schempp*, was actually a pair of cases—the Lord's Prayer case from Maryland and the Bible-reading case from Pennsylvania.

The plaintiffs in the Pennsylvania case were Unitarian parents and their children; those in the Maryland case were

Madalyn Murray and her son, both professed atheists. No parents favoring the practices were parties in these litigations. The well-known fact that the Court struck down the practices as establishing religion is of less significance than the prescription which the Court penned on the nature of religion and establishing the thing it disavowed establishing: a "religion of secularism" in the public schools. Since the compulsory attendance laws would drive all children into the public schools, except for those whose parents desired, and could afford, private education for them, this establishment was of enormous consequence to parental rights.

The Court had insisted that it was not establishing a "religion of secularism" in the public school—with this significant qualifier: "*. . . in the sense of affirmatively opposing or showing hostility to religion.*" But what if religion were simply ignored? Surely, by ignoring a thing—especially when we speak of leaving it out of the curriculum of the school-age child—we do teach, to say the least, its unimportance. The Court did not face up to that question. It substituted its own *religious* judgment that the omission would be sufficiently made up for by installing courses in comparative religion, in the history of religion, or study of the Bible for its literary and historic qualities. Religion itself could be studied if presented "objectively as part of a secular program of education." This prescription has been totally unacceptable to those many believers who do not conceive of religion as a secular matter, who consider the Bible as the word of God and who abhor comparative religion as destructive of belief. If the parent wanted the real thing for his child, religion—not as a secular program, but as religion—that could not be had where the child, at the most sensitive stage of being, would spend most of his learning years, most of his days, and most of his hours in each day. No, said the Court, the place for that was in "the home, the church, and the unviolable citadel of the [child's] mind and heart." The home and the church were thus relegated to weak collateral positions on the periphery of the educational process.

Justice Stewart, the sole dissenter in *Schempp*, clearly exposed the falsity of the Court's elaborate and deceptive rationale:

> With all its surface persuasiveness, however, this argument seriously misconceives the basic constitutional justification for permitting the exercises at issue in these cases. For a compulsory state educational system so structures a child's life that if religious exercises are held to be an impermissible activity in schools, religion is placed at an artificial and state-created disadvantage. Viewed in this light, permission of such exercises for those who want them is necessary if the schools are truly to be neutral in the matter of religion. And a refusal to permit religious exercises thus is seen, not as the realization of state neutrality, but rather as the establishment of a religion of secularism, or at the least, as government support of the beliefs of those who think that religious exercises should be conducted only in private.[21]

The new religion, officially installed, would now become the dominant factor in the formation of the new generations and the almost inevitable determinant of the national future. The consequences to parental rights would be of great significance.

Life Under The Establishment

By the close of the two decades following *Schempp*, attacks on public education had become intense and widespread. The critics were parents, some parents protesting the decline of academic quality of the public schools, others the sometimes chaotic lack of discipline and order, others the psychological manipulating of children in order to mold them to accept state-chosen attitudes for the living of their lives and for their participating in society.[22] Parental resistance to all of this took two forms: resort to private education, and various forms of protest aimed directly at public schools. At a later point we will examine what successes and failures parents have had in defending their rights in private education. We consider now defense of the parental right from within the public establishment.

Two points need be gotten out of the way at the outset:

(a) the "small minority" argument made by overzealous defenders of public education, and (b) the "willfulness" argument of some parents. Each attacks the other as utterly insincere.

The "small minority" point, everlastingly repeated by public school propagandists, insists that parental criticism of the public schools—especially on moral grounds—is nothing more than the work of a small but strident minority. Thus parents who may finally be moved to object to the placing of morally corrupting books on school library shelves, are typically lampooned as "book burners", who, though dangerous, may be scornfully dismissed as a handful of self-starters seeking to impose their views on the great majority. The smallness of their numbers is as much stressed as their "divisiveness". What this argument carefully avoids is the very point highlighted when Vashti McCollum, the *Engel* plaintiffs, the Schempps, Madalyn Murray and their pressure group supporters headed into court: the preciousness of *minority* rights. Marvelous are the works of bias: those who litigated to secularize the public schools were "lonely dissenters" (though lonely they were not) "standing up to the tyranny of the majority"; but parents who have sought to protect their children against moral defilement in the public schools are savaged by the same sources as rednecks, crypto-fascists, eager for a *Kristallnacht* at Woodrow Wilson Elementary.

The "willfulness" point is this: some parents who protect philosophic and moral evils they encounter in the public schools assume that every local and state public school official is hell-bent on promoting those evils and inventing new ones. These parents fail to see that the evils are essentially the product of the secularizing decisions of the Supreme Court. These, by removing seemingly minimal and certainly vestigial theistic observances from the schools (or options for the same) have only removed what was largely symbolic, it is true; but the symbols summarized a whole philosophy of life, just as the obliterators of the symbols summarized a radically different philosophy of life. Whether the latter could succeed without the ultimate guidance of theistic principle, without the sanction of ten precepts which are "commandments" only because believed to be given by an immutable power deemed transcendent to "society", majorities, or government, remained to be discovered. And the discovery, thereafter, of moral chaos in the public schools gave many parents an answer. But in many cases the local teachers and other school officials were powerless to prevent the ill effects which inevitably flowed downward from the Court's decisions. In the many school districts of the country where the old theistic moral sanctions had been implicit (but often explicit), in the school regimen, life went on—the lives of children, that is, with all of their questions, probings, problems, varieties of conduct, and personal crises. To these guidance or responses had to be given. The overall question being: how should life be lived? the answer had to omit being grounded in a transcendent and universal ethic deemed binding. If a child were to ask why not steal? the answer would be because it isn't fair, because we don't do it at Woodrow Wilson High, because it isn't nice, because it's anti-social, because democracy frowns upon it, because you wouldn't like someone to steal from you—but each of those answers was a surface answer only, easily opening up further questions.

Aware of the moral vacuum created by the dereligionizing decisions of the Supreme Court, other forces now rushed in. And over the next two decades answers to the questions of how life shall be lived were widely installed in the public schools.

Philosophic sources for the new values were to be found in the prescriptions of, for example, Professor Ulich, who, in 1965, said he saw the public school teacher as having a mission to

> . . . educate free minds who, on the one hand, appreciate the depths of man's religious tradition but to whom, on the other hand, the old denominational and dualistic conflicts appear secondary, if not inhibitive to, a unifying world outlook.[23]

The meaning was that the teacher's task is to teach children, regardless of their religious background, that Lutheranism, Judaism, Catholicism, etc., (a) have profound traditions, but (b) their disagreements—*i.e.*, *doctrinal* differences—are "secondary"; these will inhibit the children's having a "unifying world outlook". (Not to worry: that will be supplied them.)

Other chapters in this book will enlarge upon the problems encountered by parents with respect to public education. These have included sex courses (often under another label such as "Health," "Hygiene", etc.) and instruction in Marxian or other materialist social views (again under a variety of headings such as "Social Studies", "Problems of Democracy", "Population Problems", etc.). For those parents forced by economic circumstances, the unavailability to them of private education, or simply a strong desire for public education (but one non-intrusive upon, say, Christian values), what avenues of relief exist? Three suggest themselves (1) grass roots action at the local school board level, (2) legislation, (3) litigation.

Parent action at the local level has been at times effective in helping achieve the ouster of teachers who have violated the consciences of parents by unacceptable teaching or conduct, or in convincing school boards that particular course content, or books or other instructional materials are offensive and should be barred. But where programs are imposed by statute, grass roots protests may not succeed. Such protests, too, often encounter the factors of the inertia of the many parents who don't care and the strident counterattack of those who desire the programs to be imposed upon all children and attack proponents of child freedom as "book burners".

Legislation is at once the soundest basis for protecting parental freedoms in education and the most difficult to achieve. The changing of state laws so as to eliminate offensive items from the mandated curricula and to put clear limits upon the freedom of administrators and teachers to impose or suggest secularist values calls not only for meticulous drafting but for major political clout. Except where parents can find strong allies in politically effective statewide lobbies (such as, for example, church organizations) they are likely to be outpressured by the well financed groups which often were responsible for putting the bad legislation in place to begin with.

An example of a legislative effort currently being made at the federal level is, however, instructive. The "equal access" proposal[24] calls for cutoff of federal funds to any public school district which would deny high school students the right to form their own religious organizations and to conduct meetings of them on campus. Here would be a meaningful accommodation to the religious and moral liberties of students (and hence to parental liberties). At the least, the enjoyment of rather commonplace liberties to associate, to learn and to discuss ideas—in the setting (the school) most appropriate for such intellectual and fraternal undertakings would be given protection. The proposal is modest. It is limited to high schools. If enacted, it would be only a useful and desirable makeweight to the pervasively secularist regime of the public school. As of this writing, the "equal access" legislative effort is instructive in two ways: it shows that good drafting and competent salesmanship of a reasonable idea *can* succeed. As of this writing, the "equal access" measure has not passed. But that it very nearly did pass the House without the aid of a large national lobby and of a long campaign, is encouraging. The bill's defeat in the House in May is also instructive. It was due to the intensive opposition of essentially the same pressure groups which had supported the *McCollum*, *Engel* and *Schempp* challenges to the accommodation of religious liberty in the public school. Nothing more vividly illustrates the almost fanatical will to impose secularism upon the nation's children than the furious campaign to suppress "equal access".

Litigation has by and large thus far proved an unsuccessful avenue of relief for parents who oppose a secularist regime in the public schools. Many of the failed cases, however, have been cases in which all essential constitutional issues were not raised or good trial records developed. (A promising exception appears to be the Creationism litigation presently in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana.[25]) If parental freedoms are to be vindicated in the courts, it will be essential that *all* relevant constitutional issues will be raised, sharply defined, and then given life through thoroughly developed trial records. The issues to be raised involve much more than the familiar attack on "Secular Humanism". Rights to know, to learn and to teach (and other academic liberties), rights of familial privacy (including sexual privacy), and rights against enforced indoctrination are the bases of essential issues to be raised, along with, for many parents, moral and religious liberty.

For those who have come to doubt the worthwhileness of struggle on the front of parental freedom, the *Studs Terkel* case, in 1982, should lend a sense of hope. Highlighted in the media as a case of "book burning", it was in fact a case of "book forcing". The case is spoken of as the "Studs Terkel" case because the media played up the well-known Chicago journalist as the hero of the event. The media also lampooned the parents whose liberties were extinguished by a public school board, and ignored the two boys whose heroic stand was finally vindicated (as the media also ignored the vindication). The affair is a laboratory example of a parental rights crisis—where parents prevailed over the bureaucracy.

The facts are simple. The Girard (Pennsylvania) High School assigned Terkel's book, *WORKING*, a best seller, for reading by the students. Two boys of Christian background refused to read it since the book contains much foul language, repeated irreverent use of the names of Christ and God, and a chapter (entitled "Hooker") describing the life of a prostitute and classifying her career as one among many fields of gainful occupation, or work. The boys and their parents vigorously objected to the assignment. They requested an alternative assignment. This was denied them. One of their parents then formally requested either that *WORKING* be withdrawn from use by the School District or that the boys be given alternative assignments. The School District refused, upholding the teacher's position that it was important to introduce her students to "the present reality of work and the working world." At a public hearing which ensued, the public school directors, invited Lester "Studs" Terkel to come to Girard High School to discuss his book. Terkel appeared at two assemblies held at the school, and liberally used these forums to ridicule those who had objected to his book. National media coverage of the event was approved and assisted by the school authorities. The atmosphere thus engendered was one wherein Terkel was lionized by the school and in which the boys were pressured to recant, forego their religious and moral convictions, and conform to the school's demand. The press and national TV informed America that here was an attack on public education brought by "book burners".

The School Board on March 22, 1982, voted to deny the parents' request for an alternative reading, stating that "portions of the book may well be offensive to them and their children. ***With all deference due the parents, their sensibilities are not the full measure of what is proper education.***" The Board then ruled that failure of the boys to read the assignments would prevent their graduating from Girard High School on June 2, 1982.

The parents (people of modest financial means) were able to obtain free legal counsel who proceeded to draft a complaint, on their behalf and that of the boys, against the school authorities, alleging violation of freedom of conscience, of religion and parental rights. The complaint pointed to the obvious "book forcing" in the Board's refusal to make any assignment to the boys from the myriad sources of literature available.

About to be faced publicly with the ***real*** issue (book forcing) instead of the bogus issue ("book burning") and the possibility of court trial and an injunction, the School Board dropped its plan to punish the two boys for having sought to enjoy freedom of conscience and mind in a public school. The media suddenly lost interest in the case. As an interesting postscript, the liberal lawyer-writer, Nat Hentoff, caught up with the case some months later and, in a series of articles in *Village Voice*, soundly berated the

Girard School Board for its suppression of civil liberties. Hentoff went to the heart of the matter:

> Contrary to the pietism of some insatiably anticlerical civil libertarians (which means they are flawed civil libertarians), the purpose of the public schools is *not* to homogenize children but to respect their differences. Kids have a First Amendment right to *be* different, to *believe* differently, in the public schools. And, Justice Robert Jackson added, 'Freedom to differ is not limited to things that do not matter much. That would be a mere shadow of freedom. The test of its substance is the right to differ as to things that touch the heart of the existing order.' [26]

THE PRIVATE SCHOOL CRISIS

While the exercise of critically important parental rights in public education remains frustrated, in private education the situation has been mixed, with significant victories achieved and major defeats. Our focus here is not, of course, upon parents who have chosen private schools whose policy is to subject themselves totally to whatever the state educational offices may require. Many private schools desire to be in what they deem the "mainstream"; they hence appear to conceive that the bureaucracy possesses true educational wisdom. They find it useful to advertise that they are "state-chartered", "state-accredited" or "state-approved". (And these submissions may also bring rewards in terms of state financial aid.) Here are obviously no parental rights issues; no parental rights are being asserted or challenged.

The "private school crisis" to which we now turn is that which occurs when parents deliberately choose a school which does not conform to the educational prescriptions of the bureaucracy or will not take a state license to exist. This crisis is principally seen in those cases of the past decade and a half involving evangelical and fundamentalist Christian schools. While these cases center upon the religious liberty of parents (and often of churches and teachers), they in fact embrace a wide range of First Amendment freedoms. These cases have arisen in Vermont, Ohio, Nebraska, Kentucky, North Dakota, Iowa, Maine and some other states. Perhaps the case best representative of these new parental rights struggles is the *Rudasill* case which arose in Kentucky in 1977.

In *Rudasill* the Kentucky State Board of Education, profoundly agitated that small fundamentalist Christian schools were springing up without seeking state "approval" (licensing), decided that it must stamp out such dangerous insurrection. The chairman of the State Board appeared especially provoked by the fact that the fundamentalist parents desired their children to be in schools which taught that "everything in the Bible is literally true." When the parents and pastors refused to buckle, a Herodian decree issued from the State Board: any parent in Kentucky who had a child enrolled in a non-"approved" school must be criminally prosecuted. But as the parent hunt was about to start, the hunted became the hunters: parents went into Franklin County Circuit Court and—on First Amendment grounds—obtained a preliminary injunction against the Commonwealth. That set the stage for full trial.

Is it the bureaucracy's paranoia or is it the bureaucracy's swollen vanity which, in so many cases where it has warred against religious schools, causes it to treat the cases as supreme emergencies, justifying any sort of expenditure of the people's money? Kentucky now at once retained outside counsel to defend it—a former governor of Kentucky and senior partner in one of the largest firms in the state. Somehow, missing from the bureaucracy's thoughts as it prepared to stamp out dissidence, was consideration by the state of its *own* household. Upon the lengthy trial which now ensued, the glaring contrasts between Kentucky's public schools and the Christian schools became evident—and not to the advantage of the State Board's case.

One of the worst disadvantages which the state suffered upon the trial was the very testimony from which the state was most sure it would benefit: that of the Christian parents. These were supposed to be ignorant folk, far less able to discern what was best for their children than was the state. The state's scenario, furthermore, read that it was the state which really loved the kids and whose motherly instincts would best protect them from the harm of "bad education". The parents, on the witness stand, disappointed the state's expectations—nay, confounded the state.

The parents' case, however, did not consist essentially of defense. They soon had on line a parade of expert witnesses, and a progression of exhibits, which shortly reversed the role which the state had been confident it would play in the trial. Cockily opening on the grand presumption that the state alone has competence in education, the state was soon brought unpleasantly close to the question of whether, in view of the calamitous state of public education in Kentucky, it had *any* real competence in education. While Christian parents were to be criminally prosecuted for the "truancy" of having their children in "unapproved" schools, the truancy officer in Louisville was forced to testify that wholesale public school truancy had long been taking place—*real* truancy, that is—and largely unprosecuted. Too, the state, confronted with the good results in nationally standardized basic skills tests taken by the Christian school children, was forced to acknowledge (a) that public school children were not similarly tested and (b) to go on to state the absurdity that testing proves nothing.

Put into sharp focus in the Kentucky trial was the constant theme of values. The State Board appeared particularly concerned that it keep a tight grip on who should teach in Kentucky and what should be taught. The parents' testimony, on the other hand, saw these areas as intimately related to the most important thing of all—the freedom of their children to absorb precisely the values for which the parents had chosen the schools and to have no values alien to these imposed.

The trial court held in favor of the parents. The State Board appealed. On October 9, 1979, the Supreme Court of Kentucky handed down a remarkable decision in the case. It, too, upheld the parents but did so on a striking basis—an ancient provision of the Kentucky Bill of Rights which reads as follows:

> Sec. 5 Right of religious freedom.—No preference shall ever be given by law to any religious sect, society or denomination; nor to any particular creed, mode of worship or system of ecclesiastical polity; nor shall any person be compelled to attend any place of worship, to contribute to the erection or maintenance of any such place, or to the salary or support of any minister of religion; ***nor shall any man be compelled to send his child to any school to which he may be conscientiously opposed***; and the civil rights privileges or capacities of no person shall be taken away, or in anywise diminished or enlarged, on account of his belief or disbelief of any religious tenet, dogma or teaching. No human authority shall, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience. (Emphasis added.)

Because a state Supreme Court's interpretation of its own state constitution is final and ordinarily not reviewable by the Supreme Court of the United States, the latter court rejected the State Board's effort to secure a reversal of the parental rights upheld by the Kentucky Supreme Court. Only one other Christian school case has reached the Supreme Court of the United States, the now famous *Faith Baptist* case out of Nebraska.[27] This case was, however, a poor vehicle to test the basic issues involved, and the Supreme Court declined to hear argument in it. Thus it can be said at the present that the Supreme Court has not yet passed upon all the specific issues which a case such as the *Rudasill* case raises. One of these days, the Court will undoubtedly take such a case for review, and when it does it is to be hoped that the case will be one in which a strong trial record delineating parental rights, and exploring state presumptions, will have been made. Meanwhile, because of their singular relationship to our wider liberties, the cases involving rights to educate outside of state control must be well defended.

POSTSCRIPT: PARENTAL RIGHTS AND PUBLIC AID

In the 1960s the focus of argument on parental rights was public aid to religious schools—or to children in them, or to their parents. Distributive justice, so it was said, entitled parents whose conscience directed them to educate their children in religious schools, required that the education be given participation in tax benefits. It was inherently unfair that, if the public interest value of the compulsory attendance laws was achieved by enrollment in a religious school no less than in a public school, tax dollars should not support the religious school education. Religious schools contribute at least equally to the common good. Why should a parent pay twice for education—once to support the public school and again to support a private school of conscientious choice? And did that not, in effect, render that parent a "second class citizen"?

Identified throughout the 1960s as an advocate of public aid to the religious school interest, I have since revised my views of the matter. First, while I earlier readily acknowledged that worries concerning some degree of public control accompanying such aid should be discounted in view of the benefit to educational freedom which the aid would effect, it became apparent to me a decade ago, that anything but absolutely minimal public control, carefully limited in scope to specific programs of aid, is dangerous to the genuinely religious school. If a child in a religious school is afforded school bus transportation at public expense, and public controls of that program are limited to the transportation and in no way reach into the life of the school, fine. But any form of aid (whether designated as aid to the child, to the parent, or to the school) which would impose standards or programs upon the school beyond its being one in which a child can fulfill his attendance requirement under an absolutely minimal truancy law should be deemed unacceptable. That is, of course, if the school has high self respect and a strong sense of its religious integrity. It is basic and right that public controls follow public expenditures. True, the controls should always be limited to the specific thing which the public buys. The public, however, cannot do much buying in the field of education before it is buying into *value* areas—teachers, curriculum, teaching methods, pupil performance, "standards" of all sorts. Those programs upheld by the Supreme

Court in *Meek v. Pittenger* and *School District of Pittsburgh vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, et al.*, undoubtedly represent the outer limits of program support which private—and especially religious—schools should consider tolerable. The private school crisis presented by the NLRB and unemployment compensation cases—but especially the school licensing cases in Ohio, Kentucky, Vermont, Nebraska, Maine, Michigan and North Dakota—indicate, disturbingly, the mind-set of all too many governmental agencies that it is their responsibility to manage areas of private education or all of private education.

Second, it is now abundantly clear that public aid, even if it were to be without strings attached, is *not* indispensable to parents who want private education. That is especially true with respect to religious private education. The Catholic school system originated with immigrants, powerless and penniless in the American society. Catholic schools, in the depths of the depression, *were being built*, not closed. One thing caused this: the intensity of Catholic religious faith. Though public aid had been sought for Catholic schools at least as early as the 1840's, such aid had been carefully denied—even to the point of amending state constitutions to insure that legislatures could never grant it. It has been said that the Catholic schools were able to flourish nonetheless because of the large number of nuns who, under vows of poverty, staffed the schools. But that, too, was due simply and solely to the same factor: the intensity of Catholic religious faith. *No* quantity of public funding, however great (and even if it were without strings) can cause religious schools to be strong and to multiply. Funding may, indeed, *weaken* such schools not only because of the inevitable bureaucratic controls which it will impose, but because of what it may do to initiative, the spirit of sacrifice, and the dedication of religious adherents.

The evangelical and fundamentalist Christian school movements, originating in the 1960s and now highly visible in all fifty states, bear out the truth of the foregoing. Schools of generally fine quality, which have resulted are flourishing without public aid; indeed, they adamantly refuse public aid, even the "aid-to-the-child" kind (except, in some few instances, public busing).[28] Parents, pastors and teachers in such schools have made heavy financial sacrifices in order to establish and maintain these schools in the past two decades of inflation, high taxes and employment insecurity, and aggressive punitive tactics by state and federal bureaucracies. The teachers are especially noteworthy to the observer of the schools as dedicated religious who serve the children committed to their charge at heroic personal sacrifice. But in nothing has the strength of the Christian school movement been more strikingly shown than in the willingness of its members to face fines and imprisonment for the sake of their faith. The trial scenario in the aforementioned *Rudasill v. Kentucky State Board of Education*[29] is "must" reading for anyone seriously interested in American freedoms and, in particular, parental rights.

The conclusion that private schools should not be governmentally subsidized, however, cannot be the end of our inquiry. Left standing is an injustice and a major danger.

The injustice pertains to the fact that parents who exercise a constitutional liberty to choose non-government education for their children are yet taxed to pay for government schools. The steady rise in per-pupil education cost in the past two decades (leaving out of account special costs attributable to unnecessary public educational ventures) threatens parents who desire to maintain non-governmental schools and who choose to reject the state schools. It is nonsense to say that those parents are yet "perfectly free" to choose non-public education. This chapter is not the place for exposition of the legal means whereby the injustice of a double burden of educational cost can be eliminated, but the governing principle is clear: if the parent meets the requirements of a reasonable compulsory attendance law by paying for a non-governmental education for his child, that parent should not be required to pay for another education which he does not choose.

The danger pertains to the fact that the state may become the almost exclusive educator of children—and thus the molder of the citizenry—by virtue of this almost unlimited financial power. Due to the Supreme Court rulings discussed in this chapter, this means the state-compelled funding of secularism. If the school tax is so structured as to provide the tax relief we have suggested, then it will be possible to have a philosophical pluralism in American education, the healthful existence of genuine parental choice, and the consequent reduction of the danger of a totalitarian society.

Footnotes

1. *Wisconsin v. Yoder* 406 U.S. 205 (1972).
2. See, *e.g.*, Thomas Dubay, *Philosophy of the State as Educator* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1959) pp. 55-57.
3. Ibid., pp. 55-57.
4. Ibid., p. 63.
5. See, O.J. Scott, "The Government As Parent", *Chalcedon Report*, Apr. 24, 1984.
6. Prime sources of information are John Holt whose newsletter, *Growing Without Schooling*, is an invaluable source of current information (729 Boylston Street, Boston, MA 02116), Ed Nagel's National Association For The Legal Support Of Alternative Schooling, P.O. Box 2823, Santa Fe, NM 87501, and Dr. Raymond Moore, Hewitt Research Foundation, P.O. Box 9, 36211 S.E. Sunset View, Washoughal, WA 98671.
7. A noteworthy exception has been seen in the Roman Catholic bishops of Pennsylvania whose successful resistance to the imposition of NLRB jurisdiction on Catholic schools caused them to refuse to submit even to initial NLRB proceedings as a step antecedent to appealing therefrom into the courts. Instead they attacked NLRB jurisdiction from the outset by suing for an injunction to bar *any* NLRB proceedings. They succeeded. See *Caulfield v. Hirsch*, ___ F. Supp. ___, 95 LRRM 3164 (E.D. Pa., 1972); *McCormick v. Hirsch*, 430 F.Supp. 1337 (1978).
8. *Sloan v. Lemon*, 413 U.S. 825 (1973), affords a good example. Here a state statute had provided for tuition grants to parents of children in nonpublic schools. Then the statute was challenged on church-state separation grounds. Although parents intervened in support of the statute, claiming themselves and their children to be the sole beneficiaries of the legislation, the Supreme Court held the statutes a disguised subsidy to religious schools, not so much as discussing whether a parental interest might be involved.
9. L. and R. Lichter and S. Rothman, "Media and Business Elites", *Public Opinion*, October/November, 1981. This study of the nation's major media executives concluded that they seek to use their programming to create a new society based upon secular humanist presumptions and values.

10. *McCollum v. Board of Education*, 333 U.S. 204 (1948).
11. Although parents were role actors as parties, the litigation scenarios were, in the main, attributable to major organizations whose programs called for a complete revolution in the values by which American children in the public schools should be molded.
12. *Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421 (1962).
13. *Abington Township School District v. Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203 (1963).
14. The basic inventing occurred in *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947), wherein Justice Hugo Black, in dictum, speaking for the Court, devised a view of the Establishment Clause, completely unknown to history, whereby the Clause was seen to bar any use of tax money "to support any religious activities" (*id.*, at 15-16) apparently without regard to any consequence to the consciences of those tax-paying parents and their children who could not accept a sterile irreligious learning environment for their children.
15. These groups in the three cases were General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, American Civil Liberties Union, Synagogue Council of America, American Ethical Union, Joint Conference Committee on Public Relations (Baptist Convention), American Unitarian Association, American Jewish Committee, and American Humanist Association.
16. She prevailed although she had failed to allege any violation of the federal Constitution. The Supreme Court said that the fact that the Illinois courts had dealt with such question sufficed.
17. *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, 403 U.S. 602, 689 (1971).
18. "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our Country."
19. *Engel v. Vitale*, 206 N.Y.S. 2d 183, 192 (1961).
20. *Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421, 424 (1962). (Emphasis supplied.)
21. *Schempp, supra*, at 313.
22. See: Barbara M. Morris, *Change Agents in the Schools* (Barbara M. Morris Report, Ellicott City, Md., 1979), Tim LaHaye, *The Battle for the Mind* (Old Tappan, N.J.: Revell, 1980), Jeane Westin, *The Coming Parent Revolution* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1981).
23. P. Freund and R. Ulich, *Religion and the Public Schools* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965), p. 50.
24. H.R. 4996, 98th Cong., 2d Sess., "Religious Speech Protection Act". If the Congress declines to enact "equal access" legislation, it is to be hoped that the decision of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania in *Bender v. Williamsport Area School District*, 563 F.Supp. 697 (M.D. Pa., 1983) upholding the "equal access" principle on free speech grounds, will be affirmed.
25. *Aguillard v. Treen*, No. 81-4787 (E.D. La.).
26. N. Hentoff, "Not All My Books' Enemies Are My Enemies", *The Village Voice*, May 10, 1983, p. 4.
27. *State ex rel. Douglas v. Faith Baptist Church*, 207 Neb. 802, *appeal dismissed*, 454 U.S. 803 (1981).

28. In Ohio and Pennsylvania, where various sorts of "auxiliary services" now have U.S. Supreme Court sanction, these are largely declined by evangelical and fundamentalist schools. They are wary, for example of state-supported so-called guidance and counseling services due to attitudes and values which the counselors may manifest.
29. *Rudasill v. Kentucky State Board of Education*, 589 S.W.2d 877 (1979), cert. den., 446 U.S. 938 (1980).

TWO

Pluralism, Equal Liberty, and Public Education

Stephen Arons

Pluralism in American education is a tenet more honored in the breach than in the observance. As a nation, our ideals, our constitution, our history, and the self-protective instincts of our subcultures all proclaim the importance of pluralism. Yet our public school systems rarely observe or encourage meaningful diversity. No doubt teachers and other school personnel, confronted with a pluralistic clientele, want to preserve and respect that diversity; but they are prevented from doing so by the financial and political structure of schooling.

It is difficult—even painful—to admit the possibility of a flaw in the foundation of public education; but it is there. The right of educational choice, and the absence of majority control of the content of schooling, are both essential to preserving pluralism. Yet neither is to be found built into the structure of schooling. We have reformed and repaired our schools in periodic bursts of legislative, judicial, and political energy; but the fundamental assumption through all these efforts has remained that the majority may justifiably use schools to impose its version of the good life upon a captive audience which includes large numbers of dissenters.[1]

In 1925 the principles of pluralism and educational liberty were applied directly to the structure of schooling. In that year the Supreme Court handed down *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*[2] in which the justices insisted that "the child is not the mere creature of the state," and ruled that no state may deny any family access to an alternative to government run schools. The decision that the fundamental principles of liberty insure a right to school choice was an act of pluralism at a time of extreme right-wing jingosim in American history.[3] The Court saw that schooling concerned socialization and the development of the individual mind, and refused to make this influence the sole possession of the political majority. But beyond this it left the balance of power between family and state unresolved.[4]

Nearly sixty years later the *Pierce* doctrine retains its vitality in Supreme Court opinions as well as in public debate over school policy. Virtually no legislator, litigant, or educator contends that non-government schools should be eliminated or that the government should regulate them so heavily as to make them identical to public schools. Although the importance of freedom of choice has been trumpeted, the reality is that it does not exist. Since 1925, economics has made the right of school choice the property of the rich, while politics has transformed freedom of choice from an instrument of pluralism to a tool of school segregation.[5] The design flaw in schooling which *Pierce* sought to correct has become even more entrenched by virtue of economic and political developments. The lesson of the 60 years since *Pierce* is that the liberty which sustains pluralism cannot be reclaimed without ending economic inequality in school choice.

Education, Pluralism, and Cultural Consensus

Schooling is two-edged. It is a process of opening minds, liberating the thought process, creating a marketplace of ideas and beliefs in which individuals' minds move unencumbered by government and political majorities. Schooling-as-liberation, as this might be called, fosters critical thinking and the possibility of transcending the status quo which sometimes routinizes the life of the intellect and the spirit. But schooling is also a process of transmitting particular values, worldviews and beliefs to the rising generation. Indeed, schooling as socialization aims to transmit an entire set of cultural assumptions from one generation to the next, thereby legitimizing and inculcating the beliefs of adults in the minds of children. This manipulation of ideology and consciousness has often been the means by which competing social or political groups attempt to replicate their own visions and meanings through education. These two aspects of schooling—the liberating and the socializing—are two faces of a single process, the process of communication. The two functions are in tension. No school socializing is ever efficient and relentless enough to make students into mere culture clones; and no liberating schooling can avoid transmitting a large number of beliefs and assumptions along with its small portion of transcendence or skepticism.

What the two parts of schooling have in common is the fact that neither is ever value-neutral or value-free. What is being taught, tested, contested, transmitted, and influenced in school is, at bottom, meaning. Even facts rest ultimately upon beliefs, assumptions, and worldviews for their legitimacy. Stretched thin across a pluralistic society, value-laden schooling cannot avoid the contest over meanings, and cannot help but be pulled, tugged, and sometimes torn asunder by the competing desires of subcultures, families and individuals to see themselves reflected in the nation's primary child-rearing institution. When schooling is majority-controlled in content as well as form, these struggles over conscience are exaggerated and pluralism is put at risk of being swept away by orthodoxy. The history of value conflicts in American schooling reveals that the majoritarian structure of the school system makes the preservation of pluralism difficult and sometimes impossible.[6]

The effort to preserve pluralism in compulsory, universal, publicly funded schooling has been slow as well as difficult. By the close of the nineteenth century an increasing number of cases were being litigated in which the liberty provisions of the Bill of Rights were being invoked by teachers, families, private schools, and religious communities seeking refuge from orthodoxy in pluralism.[7] The nature of these conflicts reveals that from the late 19th century on, the society was making vigorous use of the schools to define and maintain social cohesion, and that individuals and groups seeking freedom from the dominant ethic faced an uphill struggle. As the 20th century wore on and the battles over socialization in schools continued, the courts and the public continued to have trouble applying the idea of freedom of intellect and spirit to a compulsory and majority-controlled school system. A fundamental confusion began to creep into the legal ideology of schooling. At the very times in which the Court was upholding the rights of teachers, students, or families to be free of the "pall of orthodoxy," the idea emerged in judicial opinions that the legitimate purpose of schooling is to "establish and apply their curriculum in such a way as to transmit community values." The Court stated in one case that "there is a legitimate and substantial community interest in promoting respect for authority and traditional values be they social, moral, or political."[8]

In cases brought in defense of civil and religious liberty, certain infringements of individual rights were curbed by the courts, but the common assumption came to be that the prevailing political majority (or whatever passed for it in running the local schools) could use the schools to impose its values on everyone in spite of the resistance of dissenting families, groups or individuals.[9] Majority control has thereby been legitimized without even asking the question of whether freedom of intellect and spirit and the pluralism which depends on it are inconsistent with majority control of school content. As the public and judicial commitment to majority control becomes more entrenched, it proves still more difficult to secure liberty and provide for the defense of pluralism. Everyone admires the emperor's new clothes, while reality recedes from view under the pressure of legal fictions and ideological assumptions.

This attempt to inject liberty into schooling has been important, but it has remained peripheral because the core issue was ignored. In the abstract sense the victim was pluralism—the diversity of traditions and worldviews among groups and individuals in a single culture. In a concrete sense the victims were blacks and other racial minorities; Catholics; Amish, Christian fundamentalists, and other religious minorities; language and culture minorities; political and cultural dissenters of all stripes; and those who could neither buy their way out of the public school struggle over orthodoxy, nor gain the power and resources necessary to bargain within the school system.

No more violent and destructive example of the repression of pluralism through schooling exists in American history than the systematic stigmatization and denial of liberty and resources imposed upon black Americans by majority culture.[10] But the nature of the majoritarian process in education has meant that at one time or another almost every cognizable group has had substantial reason to complain about their treatment. Of course many "victims" received compensation. People got educated after a fashion, even if their potentials were almost never realized. School socialization was a valuable and a desired part of assimilation for some. Enough liberation took place to sustain at least a lottery player's attitude toward the school system. And the society had a mechanism for class, economic, and racial sorting[11] and for defining and putting in place a legitimizing social cohesion in a sometimes frightening pluralistic culture.

The Anti-Value Consensus

After all these struggles over pluralism, the Supreme Court recently disclosed in the *Pico*[12] case the sacred duty of the majority to recreate itself through schooling. But the consensus which the Court thereby believes to be more important than pluralism has lost any character it might have had. It has become bland, homogenized, and assertively mediocre. The orthodoxy which prevails in public schools today is not secular humanism or socialism, not capitalism, Protestantism or militarism, but a characterless bureaucratic order bent on denying values, and overly tolerant of emptiness. Driven perhaps by a fear of value conflict, the schools have created a confused and confusing consensus which teaches the intellectually and spiritually debilitating message that there are neither values nor meanings, neither faith nor critical thinking, worthy of human commitment. The great task of the student today is to learn the institutional rules well enough either to win by playing by them, or to survive by taking advantage of them. Set against the formidable array of rewards and punishments of the bureaucratized school, the pursuit of meaning, of useful knowledge, of excitement, curiosity, unknown facts and unanswerable questions all become second-class citizens taking a back seat to a managerial mentality.

If the American public school ever was a melting pot, the consensus being cooked up there now is a thin gruel indeed. Because the absence of choice means schools cannot afford to offend anyone by school content, we have pursued a value-neutral education which does not exist. In the process we have rendered schooling and learning boring to the creative and inquiring mind, insulting to the cultural and spiritual heritages of a pluralist culture, superficial, mindless, alienating and anti-intellectual in the extreme. These results do not arise from the intentions of teachers, students, or public officials, but are produced by a school structure which penalizes choice and commitment to values while rewarding intellectual passivity and ethical numbness. The cost of ignoring the contradiction between majority control and freedom of intellect and spirit in the schools has been the creation of a sea of empty platitudes which threatens to engulf both pluralism and individuality.

Many people inside and outside the public schools are angry about this waste of human minds and spirits. Left and right, religious and secular, eurocentric and third-world, male and female, they respond with proposals, demands, reforms which seek to inject quality, meaning and engagement into the process. But they soon discover from their own experience, if not from the history of compulsory schooling, that one vision of good education cannot be established in a majority controlled school system without destroying another, and that the pursuit of mediocrity excludes all visions. Where compromise between competing worldviews is unavailable or too homogenized to have any recognizable character, the casualty is pluralism. It is not surprising, therefore, that among those who wish to rescue schooling from a mindless, anti-value morass, there has been a proliferation of conflicts over school curricula and texts as well as over the regulation of private schooling and home instruction.[13] Neither is it surprising, considering majority control of schools and inequality of choice, that most are disappointed by the results of the struggle and either succumb to apathy or continue with yet another disappointing round of efforts to create "The One Best System."[14]

School reform is a kind of American cultural neurosis which threatens pluralism. Again and again we repeat the cycle of reform and disappointment, never asking whether a pluralism of reforms might be truer to the nature of education than the pursuit of the one best system, never inquiring whether respect for family choice might create more satisfaction and quality than compulsory unification of opinion and never supposing that unnecessary conflict might be reduced if government at all levels would get out of the business of prescribing the answers to questions of conscience and human development in schools.

Meaningful Consensus and Core Values

Neither the repressiveness of imposing values through schooling nor the frequently mindless character of what is imposed there means that there is no place for consensus in education or that there are no basic values which can justifiably be imposed through schooling. If education policy makers take seriously the importance of social cohesion and the freedom of belief, two questions must be answered: Under what conditions is a meaningful and genuine social consensus likely to be achieved? And, by what standard shall we determine which values we may legitimately attempt to establish in schools?

The answer to the first question is clear to any negotiator, mediator, or citizen familiar with the operation of democratic decision-making. Agreements which are voluntarily entered into by parties of roughly equal bargaining power are much more likely to address real issues and express a true meeting of the minds than agreements which are in effect coerced. The consensus which is reached when some parties are under duress or have no real choice is a false consensus, likely to breed resentment and continuing conflict, and to fall apart. The common term for such a consensus is "tyranny." The only means to enforce such a consensus is through repression. Whatever pluralism survives this process goes underground.

If we wish to use the American system of schooling to help fashion the social cohesiveness necessary to keep a pluralistic society from becoming fragmented and chaotic, then voluntarism is central. If we wish to use the schools to define and reinforce a sense of community which is essential to social and psychological well-being, then we must insure that this voluntarism is backed by an equal opportunity for every family to subscribe to a different consensus or another community. Under the present structure of schooling in America a majority of families constitute a captive audience in the process of school consensus making. Voluntarism is watered down to the right to vote in a school board election. Were this a process for dealing with matters of behavior among adults, this system would be acceptable; but here the subject is attitudes, beliefs, values, and the development of conscience among children.

The voluntarism and choice essential to educational liberty are more likely to encourage genuine consensus than are compulsion and the absence of choice. It is a tragic irony that those most concerned with the collapse of cultural consensus are often the most strongly opposed to educational liberty. Nowhere has this point been so forcefully made as in the Supreme Court's decision in *Barnette v. West Virginia*, in which the compulsory flag salute in American schools was found unconstitutional at the height of the Second World War.

> As governmental pressure toward unity becomes greater, so strife becomes more bitter as to whose unity it shall be. Probably no deeper division of our people could proceed from any provocation than from finding it necessary to choose what doctrine and whose program public educational officials shall compel youth to unite in embracing. The ultimate futility of such attempts to compel coherence is the lesson of every such effort. . . .[15]

The second question suggests that there are values which are so basic to the American political and cultural heritage and to the survival of the nation that they can justifiably be required content for schooling. One of the historical problems of American school policy has been the tendency to go beyond this crucial core of values and use the schools to try to perfect individual character, cure social ills, and advance every intellectual, pragmatic, or reformist fad imaginable. Not only will the public schools eventually collapse under the weight of these social expectations, but the conflict which results from reducing family power and individual conscience to a near nullity makes it all the more difficult to identify those values which really are basic.

School policy debates often assume that the majority decision will occupy the field—determining what courses and content shall be required of all children, specifying what textbooks shall be used and what their content shall be,[16] establishing standardized tests which must be passed, and putting in place a hidden curriculum which teaches more than all the rest. The result is that the real core values of our culture remain unknown, slighted, or are resisted as an indistinguishable part of the excessive government regulation of educational liberty. It is counter-productive to require so much when we really need require so little.

This phenomenon is easily observable in the struggle to eliminate racism in schooling. The effort to curb legislative, judicial, and bureaucratic regulation of schooling sometimes spills over into resistance to school desegregation, so that some who oppose racial equality in schooling can camouflage their policies and intentions as opposition to the bureaucratization of education. Likewise those who oppose bureaucratization but support racial equality may find themselves unwittingly supporting political action which has racist effects. To preserve the commitment to racial equality without sacrificing educational liberty, and to struggle for freedom of choice in schooling without achieving this freedom at the expense of racial minorities, it is necessary to distinguish what the government must require in schooling from the vast area of educational decisions which ought to be left to the family in consultation with the teacher.

Some of the core values are to be found in the core document of the society, the Constitution. Foremost among these are our national commitments to individual liberty, especially privacy and freedom of belief and expression and the prohibition of racial discrimination in any form and for any reason. Further, the political order which the Constitution protects could not survive long with an uneducated public, and so it may be that the ability to read, write, calculate and understand the principles of constitutional democracy could also be among justifiable requirements for all schools. There is room for debate about what if any items could be added to the list of content requirements. The important point here, however, is that this debate needs to be undertaken with the clear understanding that it is only those few things which are demonstrably central to the nation's nature and survival which would be required. In all other matters the decisions of families and teachers should be independent of government control.

This formulation is based on the doctrine of constitutional law which holds that fundamental constitutional rights may be infringed upon by government only where it is possible to show that the state has a compelling justification for so doing.[17] Since educational liberty—both freedom from majority control of school content and the equal availability of school choice—is of constitutional magnitude, it is fitting that the standard of compelling justification be used for determining core requirements in schools. Such a standard has effectively protected both pluralism and legitimate government interests in the areas of religious freedom and freedom of expression; and there is every reason to believe that it would be as effective in striking a better balance between educational liberty and consensus in schooling than now exists.

Pluralism and the Separation of School and State

Pluralism is a much praised characteristic of American life. One way or the other each of us owes his or her presence, survival, and vitality in America to pluralism. Yet because of two structural flaws in its design the American system of education undercuts pluralism and strikes at the core of the individual liberty which sustains pluralism. Those families with strong commitments and beliefs about their own heritage, their own idiosyncratic values, and the education of their children, are discouraged by this structure from realizing their beliefs unless they are wealthy. Those who support the consensus fashioned by public schooling often find that they have subscribed to the pursuit of a lifeless mediocrity which soon drains the excitement and meaning of education. Those who neither accept this bland consensus nor can go elsewhere find themselves either the victims of majority impositions or involved in a zero-sum game of establishing one set of values at the expense of another.

The two structural flaws are basic. First, the majority control of school policy, especially content, has meant that schooling is used by those in power to establish their ideologies and worldviews or to stigmatize the values of those out of power. The fact that what is established is often a confused amalgam does not make it any less an infringement upon the consciences of dissenting families. Second, the absence of school choice for most American families has disempowered them within the public system and made it virtually impossible for them to choose to follow their consciences in matters of educating their children. The fact that American school finance systems must tax and spend in a way that discriminates against the non-rich in matters of choice increases the threat posed by majoritarianism in schooling.[18] Pluralism cannot survive these restrictions without serious distortion.

To remedy these structural problems requires a separation of school and state which would make freedom of intellect and belief consistent with universal, compulsory, publicly supported education. Efforts to preserve and protect pluralism in schools without such a separation of school and state have provided minor gains, but have been unsuccessful in getting at the root of the problem.

The proposal for a separation of school and state, in which the public would pay equally for every child's education without specifying the content or setting of that education beyond a few compelling requirements, is parallel in its justification, though not its form, to the separation of church and state which has protected religious freedom for two hundred years. With a separation of school and state no ideology, opinion, or worldview would be established by being adopted as government policy in schooling; and freedom of choice in education would be equally available to all families, regardless of income, in schools which met minimum standards based upon constitutional requirements such as non-discrimination. The analogy between schooling and religion is imperfect, but powerful. Schooling may be compulsory and publicly funded whereas religious observance may not. But at bottom each enterprise deals with values, meanings, conscience, and belief, all of which are basic to the development and consciousness of individuals, groups and subcultures. In fact, it may be argued that the manipulation and development of consciousness which take place in 35 hours of schooling each week are of far greater influence on the modern child than is religious training and practice. As Ivan Illich put it, "The school is becoming the established Church of secular times."[19]

Illich's statement provides a sharp focus for the issue of freedom of conscience and schooling, calling to mind all the dangers for individuals, for pluralism, and for the system of freedom of belief and expression which are raised by majoritarian and economically discriminatory control of schooling.

By the last quarter of the eighteenth century, the political experiences of European and American societies had indicated the importance of a complete separation of church and state. Unless religion and government were confined to separate realms, the political process would be hopelessly factionalized by irreconcilable conflict over spiritual matters, and the freedom of religion of individual citizens would be destroyed by the attempt to substitute religious orthodoxy for legitimate political consensus.

By the last quarter of the twentieth century, nearly two hundred years after the adoption of this principle of separation in the U. S. Constitution, experience again indicates the cost of building into government a continuing conflict between individual conscience and state-supported orthodoxy. Without a separation of school and state, the governing process of American schooling has been increasingly undermined by value conflict over school content, individual freedom of belief and expression has been hobbled, and pluralism has been undermined. In the last 100 years schooling has become a major means of transmitting culture. When government imposes the content of schooling and discriminates in the availability of school choice, it becomes the same deadening agent of repression from which the framers of the Constitution sought to free themselves.

The proposal for a separation of school and state, though based upon traditional American values of pluralism, individual liberty, and family responsibility, is controversial. Though very few opponents of a separation between religion and government can be found in the U.S., there are many who regard similar protection for secular pluralism and freedom of conscience in schools as unacceptable. To some, the proposal is unacceptable because it appears to threaten vested interests like teachers' working conditions, pay, and academic freedom, or the professional influence and status of school administrators, schools of education, and unions. Others see the revitalization of educational liberty as an invitation to reverse the modest progress the nation has made toward school desegregation in the past three decades. The economic disadvantages of the poor and working class in a market economy have also been cited to show that increased availability of school choice might simply move those with few resources out of the frying pan and into the fire. From this point of view the net result for most families if educational liberty were equalized would be a loss of power even compared to their weak position under majoritarianism. The balkanization of society—a kind of extreme and coercively distorted version of pluralism in which society becomes a system of religious, socioeconomic, and ethnic school ghettos—is also feared.

One of the most frequent reactions against a separation of school and state has already been discussed, the fear that the pluralist society which encourages school choice risks losing its only meaningful process for arriving at social consensus. Related, but at the other end of the social spectrum, is the fear that getting the majority out of the business of prescribing the content of schooling will change the relationship between parents and children for the worse. Either children will claim their own liberty rights against their parents and thereby involve the law in prescribing family relations, or the absence of a powerful government influence in schools will leave children at the mercy of insensitive or intolerant parents who will deny their children the liberating experience of a mind-opening education. Finally, some simply fear freedom, the unknown, change. To them even the security which is provided by a deeply flawed system is preferable to coping with the mere possibility of improving their situation.

These criticisms,[20] which come from all parts of the political, religious, economic, and cultural spectrum, are serious; and they deserve serious thought by anyone who would either suggest or resist basic reforms in American education. But what these criticisms reveal, more than possible problems with a separation of school and state, is how much is at stake in the design and redesign of the American public school system. Schooling is an intimate form of communication between the individual and his or her culture; and any forthright discussion of how this communication ought to take place naturally raises the most basic and sensitive issues about the development of the individual mind, the vitality of a pluralist tradition and the entire range of social and political relations.

The seriousness of the criticisms must be admitted; but a precondition to engaging in a thoughtful exploration of their merit must be established. The real possibility that the present structure of schooling may be undercutting the pluralism and individual liberty it is meant to defend must be acknowledged. To deal with these criticisms in the absence of a recognition that a problem of educational liberty exists is to engage in a diversionary debate of no real consequence and to obscure the very situation which gives rise to the proposal for a separation of school and state.

There have been dozens of proposals, plans, legislative efforts, and academic studies advanced in the name of educational liberty.[21] Each advances different social and political interests under the banner of school choice. The existence of so many varied reform plans and the failure to adopt any of them indicate that while a practical technical design for a separation of school and state can be produced, the public and legislative awareness that the problem of educational liberty is basic to the quality of American schooling must first be increased. To put the matter more simply, awareness of the problem is lagging behind the production of solutions. Until this is remedied, the cycle of reform and disappointment is not likely to be broken.

Blueprint for Education: Redesigning the Foundation

The separation of school and state would be an educational reform of substantially greater durability and significance than many of the specific reforms which have been advocated by private and governmental commissions over the past year. First, an equitable and libertarian redesign of the foundation of American schooling—the provision of free choice and the elimination of excessive government control of school content—goes to the core of the problem of education quality. There are so many differing definitions of what constitutes good education and what purposes good education ought to serve, that majority decisions about quality inevitably exclude a good many legitimate options and cause mismatches between students and appropriate education. As long as our school structure requires that we define a single pervasive answer to the question of quality, quality in a pluralistic society will remain unattainable.

Second, increasing the level of educational liberty makes families rather than government the primary reformers of education. When those who hold the balance of power in educational decision-making are also those who have the greatest knowledge, concern, and responsibility for the child, satisfaction is increased, conflict is made more manageable, and expertise takes its proper place as advice and service rather than control. The merit as well as the appeal of many of the reform proposals currently being discussed nationally would be greatly enhanced if those proposals were offered for family choice rather than as programmatic impositions by state and local education agencies. The nationally expressed concern for getting the government off the backs of the people in matters of education would be better directed at the local school board and state requirements than at the federal government. The few requirements to which families must adapt, and which are the legitimate business of state or federal government, concern the elimination of school segregation, the guarantee of liberty, and those content requirements which can be shown to be essential and compelling state interests.

It is not possible to evaluate here all the proposals for tuition tax credits, for education vouchers, or for the decentralization of power to families and teachers which have been put forward over the past twenty years. The bibliography at the close of this chapter will have to suffice for that task. What is possible, and necessary, for a clear recognition of the importance of educational liberty, is to state three principles essential to the separation of school and state here proposed:

1) Abolish the present lack of freedom in school choice, so as to make it possible for every family to secure the education of their children in any school in the state

meeting the education requirements. This principle would prevent the wealthy from being the only ones able to exercise the constitutional right to school choice, and would assure that children whose parents are at the bottom of the economic ladder are not priced out of the market of quality schooling by the accident of their parents' economic status.

2) Limit government requirements of schooling (whether public, independent or home schooling) to two categories: a) requirements which do not substantially affect the content of education, such as days per year, health and safety, attendance reporting, etc.; and b) content requirements which can be justified as being of fundamental and compelling importance to the society, such as guaranteeing equal access to education regardless of race, and requiring reading and writing achievement or knowledge of the principles of constitutional government. This would mean the repeal on state and local levels of most controls on curriculum and texts and the empowerment of individual families and teachers.

3) Provide a clear and enforceable policy that racial discrimination in schooling is illegal. This would mean that no school found to discriminate on the basis of race in any aspect of its operation would be regarded as satisfying the compulsory attendance laws. Discrimination, of course, should be carefully defined to prevent discrimination by any race against any other race.

Among all the concrete proposals which have been made for the creation of equal liberty in schooling, two bear special examination on the basis of the three principles stated above for achieving a separation of school and state. The work of John Coons and Stephen Sugarman of Berkeley Law School over the past decade perhaps comes closest to a complete and pragmatic design for a separation of school and state. The most detailed presentation of the proposal and the arguments for and against it are contained in their book, *Education by Choice: The Case for Family Control.* The second proposal is a bill entitled "Minnesota Educational Quality and Equity Act of 1983," introduced as

Minnesota House Bill 1072 by Assistant Majority Leader John E. Brandl, March 30, 1983. Each of these is a voucher proposal, though there is no reason that a state tuition tax credit plan could not be designed to meet the same policy objectives and legal requirements.

A blueprint for re-designing the structure of American public education is needed to end the tyranny of the majority in schooling and to reclaim educational liberty as an instrument of diversity and individual liberty rather than as a tool of economic discrimination and racism. Proposals which could achieve these goals would not call for the abolition of public support of schools or for an end to compulsory, universal, and equally accessible education. Instead they would require restructuring the foundation of the school system based upon principles which express the traditional American commitment to pluralism, freedom of intellect and spirit, and equality of opportunity.

Notes

1. Only about 10% of American students attend non-public schools. But a *New York Times* poll of February, 1983 revealed that 37% of American families with incomes under $10,000 would utilize private schools if money were not a factor. An N.I.E. study in 1983 apparently found that a similar desire for alternatives to public schooling occurred most frequently among minority race families. See "Shift to Private Schools Predicted with Tax Credit," *Education Week*, July 27, 1983. See also "Parents and School Choice: A Household Survey," U.S.D.O.E., December, 1983.

2. *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510 (1925).

3. Oregon had responded to a KKK call for the "Americanization" of "foreigners" by requiring that every child attend public school only. For a review of the legal theories by which *Pierce* has been explained see S. Arons "Separation of School & State: *Pierce* Reconsidered" 46 H. Ed. Rev. 56 (1976) especially at note 9.

4. The *Pierce* decision acknowledged, in dictum, the power of the state to make "reasonable" regulations of non-government schools, but did not specify how far these regulations might proceed in making the private alternative look like the public school. Two years later the Court invalidated regulations which were so pervasive that they made the private school identical to the public, see *Ferrington v. Tokushige*, 273 U.S. 284 (1927).

5. The Supreme Court's evaluation of freedom of choice plans appears in *Green v. New Kent*, 391 U.S. 430 (1968).

6. Any good history of education reveals the degree to which public school reform has been the vehicle for political and cultural competition among adults. See especially Tyack, *The One Best System* (1974), Nasaw, *Schooled To Order* (1980) and M. Katz, *The Irony of Early School Reform.*

7. For a comprehensive review of these cases, see Dorsen, et. al. *Political and Civil Rights in the United States,* vol. 1, 4th edition.

8. *Pico v. Island Trees,* 457 U.S. 853, 864 (1982); 102 S. Ct. 2799 (1982) at 2806.

9. In *Tinker v. Des Moines,* 393 U.S. 503 (1968), for example, the Court protected the rights of students to engage in non-disruptive, symbolic protest of the Vietnam War by wearing black armbands to school. But it granted the school board the power to define the exact nature of order, and therefore disruption in school. The result was to narrow the student right of freedom of expression substantially by suggesting a different technique for control by the schools.

10. The best overview of the cultural effect and legal involvement in creating and remedying school segregation is "The Quest for Effective Public Schools" in D. Bell, *Race, Racism, and American Law* 2nd edition (1980).

11. See D. Kirp, "Schools as Sorters," University of Pennsylvania Law Review 121 (1973).

12. See note 8 *supra.*

13. See Arons, *Compelling Belief: The Culture of American Schooling,* (1983).

14. The term is David Tyack's, *The One Best System* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1974).

15. *Barnette v. West Virginia,* 319 U.S. 624, 641 (1943).

16. Twenty-two states currently have state-wide legislatively mandated procedures for specifying which textbooks (with what content) may be used by individual teachers and local schools in the state. The political majority on a state-wide basis is therefore specifying the definition of truth which may be taught and tested in public schools.

17. See for example *Yoder v. Wisconsin,* 406 U.S. 205 (1972) in which the state of Wisconsin failed to come up with a compelling justification for requiring Amish teenagers to attend school above the eighth grade. Amish families successfully asserted their First Amendment religious rights against the compulsory attendance law.

18. The discrimination arises from the fact that while all families must pay taxes to support schooling, only the wealth of the few enables them to pay again for the tuition of an alternative to majority controlled education. This is not simply a matter of designing financial mechanisms to create economic discrimination. It conditions the exercise of a fundamental liberty—school choice—on economic status. See Arons, note 3 *supra* at pp. 101-103.

19. Ivan Illich, "Commencement at the University of Puerto Rico," *New York Review of Books,* 9 October 1969, p. 12.

20. The criticisms are collected from reactions to the idea of separation of school and state contained in the *Harvard Educational Review*, note 3 *supra; Compelling Belief*, note 13 *supra*. See for example the essay-reviews, "The Tantalizing Case for Liberty" by T. James in *Harvard Educational Review*, Spring 1984; "Education for Self Government: Reassessing the Role of the Public School in a Democracy" by C. Lawrence, *Michigan Law Review*, Spring 1984; and "Freedom of Thought and Majority Rule in the Public School: The Bankruptcy of Liberal Ideology?" by D. Tyack, *Columbia Teachers College Record*, Spring, 1984.

21. These include freedom of choice desegregation plans invalidated in *Green*, note 5 *supra*; aid to private schools invalidated in *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, 403 U.S. 602 (1973); tuition credits for private school invalidated in *Comm. for Public Education v. Nyquist*, 413 U.S. 756 (1973); tuition tax deductions for private and public schools approved in *Mueller v. Allen*, 51 USLW 5050; and a host of voucher plans, tax credit proposals and others which are laid out in detail in some of the books in the bibliography.

A Selected Bibliography on Pluralism, Liberty and Schooling

Apple, Michael, ed., *Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education*, London & Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.

Arons, Stephen, *Compelling Belief: The Culture of American Schooling*, New York: McGraw-Hill New Press, 1983.

Arons, Stephen, "Separation of School and State: *Pierce* Reconsidered," *Harvard Educational Review*, v. 46, Feb. 1976: 76-104.

Coons, John and Sugarman, Stephen, eds., *Education by Choice: The Case for Family Control*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Everhart, Robert, ed., *The Public School Monopoly*, Cambridge, Mass.: Balinger, 1982.

Friedman, Milton, *Capitalism and Freedom*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Gaffney, Jr., Edward, ed., *Private Schools and the Public Good*, Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981.

James, Thomas and Levin, Henry, eds., *Public Dollars for Private Schools*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983.

McCarthy, Rockne, et. al., *Society, State and Schools*, Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1981.

Tyack, David, *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974.

West, E. G., *Nonpublic School Aid*, Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1974.

THREE

Discipline in the Classroom

Roger Clegg

> "One of the best things we have going for us in education is that kids have a low tolerance for ambiguity. They want to know who's in charge. They want to know what's expected and the consequences. And they want to know that what's right and wrong today will be right and wrong tomorrow. . . ."
>
> —James C. Enochs, Assistant Superintendent
> Modesto City Schools, California[1]

"All behavior [in many public schools] is regarded as tolerable unless it is specifically declared illegal," according to an article in the fall 1982 issue of *The Public Interest*.[2] This statement would be closer to the truth if it did not rest on a qualification. In too many public schools, *all* behavior is tolerated whether it is legal or not.

The article, appropriately entitled "Children's Rights and Adult Confusions," goes on to describe the experience of a teacher who was subjected to verbal assaults and sexually degrading comments from a group of students in the hall. When asked why she did not report the students, the teacher replied that it would have been pointless. She knew that reporting the incident would only illustrate her vulnerability to such abuse since the students would probably not be punished. Punishment required something she lacked—witnesses.

Over the past 20 years or so, the roles of administrators, teachers and students in many public schools have become blurred. Once, schools exercised their authority to quash unacceptable behavior. Today, students walk all over those allegedly in charge. The teacher in the above example endured the students' degradation because she lacked the authority to stop them. She may have sensed the futility of trying to take action, or maybe even the danger. But at least her assaults were only verbal; thousands of teachers are not that lucky.

Teachers are not alone in suffering the consequences of relaxed disciplinary standards. Poor discipline is taking a heavy toll on every aspect of public education. Teachers and administrators pay by risking their personal safety. Taxpayers pay by footing the bill for vandalism and the countless other costs related to school crime. But the highest price is exacted from those who can least afford to be shortchanged. Students pay, and may continue to pay all their lives, by failing to get the quality education to which they are entitled.

The most compelling reason to improve discipline in public schools is that disorder presents an obstacle to the educational process. When discipline breaks down in a school, chaos ensues, distracting everyone—even those students who would prefer to concentrate on learning.

Concern over relaxed school discipline and its consequences is widespread. The 1982 "Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools" found that "lack of discipline" is the biggest problem facing public schools. Respondents believed that discipline problems, more than low salaries, account for teachers leaving the profession.[3] Concern over poor discipline was greater than concern over "lack of proper financial support," while "difficulty getting good teachers" ranked fifth among the public's school-related worries. Even drug use was of less concern to poll respondents than discipline in 1982—even though marijuana use by youths aged 12 to 17 had nearly doubled in proportion since 1972, and even though one in 16 students was smoking marijuana daily.[4] Fully 70 percent of those polled viewed a lack of discipline as a very or fairly serious problem in the public schools.

Yet some schools will not suspend unruly students for brief periods without granting them a formal hearing complete with the right of appeal.[5] Often in such schools, the principal will find it easier to ignore intolerable behavior than to cut through the red tape shielding the student from punishment. The American Federation of Teachers policy statement attributes discipline problems to "faulty public school policies framed by students' rights advocates who have been so preoccupied with protecting the difficult child that they have failed to consider the rights of the average child to learn in a disciplined, structured place." In other words, students' rights advocates are protecting the wrong students' rights.

The courts bear much of the responsibility for undermining the authority of schools and relaxing disciplinary standards by handing down decisions which are broadly applied in school systems across the country. One such ruling, *Wood v. Strickland*, delivered by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1975, determined that school officials can be held personally liable if they knew or "reasonably should have known" that the disciplinary action they took would violate the constitutional rights of a student.[6] In *Goss v. Lopez*, another 1975 Supreme Court ruling, the Court decided that students are entitled to constitutional "due process" protection from being suspended or expelled arbitrarily.[7] These and similar rulings have led to excessive caution on the part of school officials in responding to unruly, sometimes criminal behavior. For example, in some school districts, the formal hearings instituted as a result of court rulings are conducted by authorities outside the school. Whoever is attempting to discipline a student through a hearing is required to gather evidence and produce witnesses in support of the case. Consequently, some principals tend to play down student misbehavior, or even ignore it, rather than confront the difficulties inherent in attempting to suspend or expel a student who deserves to be expelled.

Concerted efforts to protect the rights of disruptive students have gradually eroded the authority of teachers. It has become increasingly apparent that many teachers lack the support of the school and the courts to maintain order in their classrooms. This weakened authority is perhaps the most significant forerunner of school crime. According to a poll conducted by the National Education Association (NEA) in 1981, over 60 percent of those teachers who had been attacked by students felt that school principals failed to take appropriate action. When a school does not respond to criminal activity with an appropriate degree of punishment, it erases all the usual distinctions between poor behavior and good behavior. Unless there are distinct, predictable consequences to one and rewards for the other, students are unable to learn a set standard of behavior on which to base their actions. Instead they learn that they can get away with almost anything.

Such a freewheeling attitude can only make a bad situation grow worse. A 1983 NEA poll revealed that since 1977 physical assaults on teachers had increased 53 percent, an increase that may be partially due to another finding of the 1983 poll: 43 percent of the students who had attacked teachers received a "slap on the wrist" or no punishment at all. If an attack on a teacher can go unpunished, then it would seem that any student conduct is permissible.

The National Institute of Education (NIE), an agency of what is now the U.S. Department of Education, published an extensive report to Congress in 1978 on disorder in public schools. NIE found that "the more firmly a school is run, the lower the incidence of violence."[8] As is apparent from the statistics in the study, many of the nation's schools were not run firmly enough. Approximately 6,700 of them had a crime problem at the time the study was conducted.[9] The NIE survey has never been duplicated in scope, but additional research on school crime and disorder indicates that lack of discipline still poses a threat to the public schools. In November 1983, the Boston Commission on

Safe Public Schools issued a report entitled, "Making Our Schools Safe for Learning," suggesting that the situation had probably worsened since 1978, when NIE published its findings.[10] Jackson Toby, Director of Rutgers University's Institute for Criminological Research concluded in a major 1983 study that the incidence of school violence was probably understated in the NIE data.[11]

Other experts allege that school crime is no worse today than NIE found it to be in 1978; but neither do they contend that it has gotten better—and that in itself is frightening.[12] During a typical month in 1976, when NIE gathered most of its data, as many as 42,000 acts of vandalism were committed against 24,000 public schools at an average cost per incident of $81.[13] Almost $2 million worth of property was stolen monthly from 10,000 schools in 13,000 separate thefts.[14] On the average, 2,000 fires were set, 1,100 bomb threats or actual bombings occurred,[15] 125,000 teachers were threatened with harm,[16] and public secondary school students were subjected to 525,000 attacks, shakedowns and robberies—all in a month's time.[17]

Obviously, there is considerable room for improvement. In any event, the issue should not be whether the problem is getting better or growing worse. Rather, any amount of violence or vandalism, any number of students or teachers who are afraid to attend school, any level of theft or destruction of school property is entirely unacceptable.

NIE found school crime so prevalent that certain crimes were more likely to be committed on school property than elsewhere. The school burglary rate was about five times that of commercial operations such as stores, which otherwise had the highest burglary rate reported in the National Crime Survey. Eight thousand public schools, one out of every ten, were burglarized each month.[18] The susceptibility of students to attack was greater in school than anywhere, except unusually high crime areas. Though 12- to 15-year-olds typically spent about 25 percent of their active time in school, 50 percent of all assaults and 68 percent of all robberies committed against them occurred there.[19]

Perhaps the reason behind the disturbing number of certain school crimes is that the offenders know they are unlikely to be punished for their misdeeds. Most offenses were committed by current students. Most offenders in assault cases were known to their victims by name.[20] Yet 83 percent of the attacks involving weapon use and attacks resulting in injury were not reported to the police. Of fights between students, 85 percent of those involving weapon use and 93 percent of those resulting in injury also went unreported.[21] In addition to being spared any involvement with the police, students who committed crimes were highly unlikely to get caught in the first place. Student reports to NIE indicated that of the more than half-million attacks, shakedowns and robberies which occurred in an average month, only 24,000 were reflected in principals' records.[22]

The Boston Commission on Safe Public Schools, in its 1983 study, agreed that student misconduct is underreported. The survey directors compared official statistics to student and teacher reports, concluding that "the results of this survey clearly suggest that official rates are sorely deficient for a comprehensive understanding of crime and violence in our schools."[23] The study indicated that the carrying of weapons during the 1982-83 school year was clearly "on the rise" and a bigger problem than official records had earlier indicated. Two hundred eighteen dangerous weapons were confiscated from students—27 percent more than had been collected the year before,[24] but far less than the number students admitted to carrying: 37 percent of the male and 17 percent of the female high school students said they had carried weapons in school at some point during the year.[25]

Such activity drains a school's power to perform the one function to which it should be wholly dedicated: the education of its students. For years, experts have been trying to improve the quality of public education. The most popular cure-all proposal has been money: the more of it education gets, the argument runs, the better education will be. But higher salaries for teachers and more elaborate equipment in an atmosphere that is conducive to neither. In a January 1984 memorandum to the President's Cabinet Council on Human Resources, the CCHR's Working Group on School Violence and Discipline suggested that no salary increase can improve educational quality "if the teachers who receive them are too afraid, or distracted, to teach. And improved buildings, materials, or curricula will avail nothing if students are too afraid, or distracted, to learn."

Student and teacher fear is a logical consequence of the poor discipline and ensuing crime in public schools. According to the NIE study, 5,200 teachers were physically attacked in a month, 1,000 of whom were injured seriously enough to require medical attention.[26] Not surprisingly, 12 percent of all teachers said they hesitated to confront misbehaving students because they were afraid.[27] Fifty percent of the teachers who responded by mail to the Boston Commission had been victims of robbery, vandalism, assault or theft during the previous school year.[28] Of those teachers, over half were victimized in the presumed safety of their classrooms—the only place, ironically, where the students seemed to feel safe. The Boston students said they felt unsafe almost everywhere else in their schools—restrooms, stairways, school grounds, school buses and bus stops.[29] The NIE study found that 22 percent of all secondary school students avoided restrooms, considering them "unsafe."[30]

The unsettling atmosphere of a poorly disciplined school causes negative effects even off campus, in the relative safety of the outside world. Teachers and students who are subjected to such an atmosphere are being cheated. Many teachers, for example, suffer a grim consequence of their profession known as "teacher burnout." When the International Labor Organization studied schools in the United States and two other countries in 1981, it found that one in four teachers "suffered from severe stress that is 'significantly' affecting their health. This stress is mainly due to pupil violence."[31] The CCHR Working Group cited a Chicago study of teacher burnout victims, describing them as "physically alive but professionally dead, . . . going through the motions of teaching, marking time until either retirement or a better job offer came along." If these teachers are unable to teach, then what and from whom are their students learning?

The worst that undisciplined schools can do to students, in terms of shaping their futures, may not be allowing their academic failure, but encouraging their criminal success. In a paper delivered to the American Society of Criminology, Jackson Toby stated that frequently committed school crimes "lose their ability to arouse indignation."[32] It is this growing casual attitude toward crime, according to Toby, that can turn a student into a criminal. A school's failure to discipline amounts to an official sanction of criminal activity, and as both the NIE and NEA studies indicated, school officials too often fail to administer adequate punishment. Suspension and expulsion, for instance, have become difficult to implement, even in response to criminal acts. Toby believes that the inability of school officials to protect their students by removing from their midst those who are violent, "reinforces criminal tendencies in youngsters who learn that they can 'get away' with offenses at school more easily than in the environing community." Toby also noted, however, that "the main significance of school crime may be that what is rehearsed in school may be practiced outside of school" later in life.

Toby's argument is simple. Crime breeds more crime, both in school and in society. The longer it takes to put discipline back in the public schools, the longer school crime will thrive, and the more damage will be done to education and to students.

So far, officials have typically responded to school crime by trying to police it. Burglar alarms are installed, security guards are posted, and teachers spend valuable time monitoring their classrooms, all in the interest of protecting the school and everyone inside from disruptive students. The taxpayers may think their taxes are spent on education, but in reality they are paying for stepped-up security measures. The National PTA has observed that the annual cost of school vandalism, something in the vicinity of $600 million, exceeds the nation's total expenditure on textbooks.[33] When you add to that figure the inestimable cost of lost teacher time, the increasing price of school security systems, and the countless other costs related to school crime, the total expense is staggering. Simply strengthening school security is a costly and, based on current statistics, a debatable method of reducing school crime.

On the other hand, the implementation of strict, consistent disciplinary practices has proven to be an effective and virtually cost-free method of responding to the problem. The Boston Commission study agreed that most school crime can be attributed to "a lack of clear systemwide commitment to constructive and firm treatment of discipline problems."[34] And the NIE study discovered that "the single most important difference between safe schools and violent schools was found to be a strong, dedicated principal who served as a role model for both students and teachers, and who instituted a firm, fair and consistent system of discipline."[35]

The transformation of George Washington Preparatory High School, in the Watts section of Los Angeles, is proof of the difference such a principal can make. Five years ago, George Washington Preparatory High School was noted as one of the worst schools in the Los Angeles area. *Time* magazine later described it as "most people's Hollywood image of the blackboard jungle."[36] It had a serious drug problem, a preponderance of gangs and violence, an absentee rate of 28 percent, and one of the lowest academic ratings in the entire county. In essence, the students were given the freedom to do as they pleased—and the result was chaos.

Today, George Washington High bears little resemblance to the school it once was. Now it is a school with a safe environment where students eagerly accept the opportunity to concentrate on academic achievement. Unlike the 800 students who were bused away in 1979, largely because they wanted the type of education the school could not offer, virtually no one wants to leave today. In fact, the school currently has a list of over 200 students waiting to enroll. Absenteeism has been reduced by 80 percent. In the 1982 school year, suspensions fell nearly 40 percent and crime was down 59 percent. Though five years ago less than half of the senior class even thought about going to college, 80 percent of the graduating seniors actually did so in 1983. According to the Los Angeles *Herald Examiner*, "achievement has leaped as misbehavior has plunged." George Washington "boasts the L.A. school district's biggest increase in the number of students taking the Scholastic Aptitude Test and the inner city's lowest percentage of students barred from extracurricular activities by poor grades."[37]

The stimulus behind Washington High's dramatic transformation is George McKenna, the type of principal described in NIE's prescription for safe schools, and a man President Reagan has described as "a hero with faith in . . . common sense values."[38] When McKenna came to Washington High in 1979, he moved quickly to restore order. He implemented a strict code of discipline which required the signatures of both students and parents. Students were no longer permitted to smoke, loiter, gamble, fight, or carry radios or drugs on school grounds. One of the rules of conduct states that "defiance of the authority of school personnel either by behavior, verbal abuse or gestures is not permitted." McKenna also instituted a dress code, attendance rules, and daily homework requirements. In signing the "parent/student contract," students "agree to abide by" the "rules, policies and regulations of the school," and parents "undertake to become personally involved" in their children's education.

Washington High did not need more money for higher salaries or more elaborate equipment in order to become a model school. It needed discipline, and discipline has made all the difference.

Gallup polls have indicated for the past ten years that the public wants discipline restored to the schools. This wish has been expressed most urgently by minorities. A greater proportion of minorities believe poor discipline is a serious threat to public education, and justifiably so.[39] Minority students are more likely to be victimized by school crime, more likely to have their learning disrupted, and thus, less likely to receive a good education.

Minorities have a special interest in improving school discipline. Almost three-fourths of all minority families have children in school; in 1981, 71 percent of black and 75 percent of Hispanic households had school age children, compared to only 52 percent of white households.[40] Even more significant, disorderly schools are effectively robbing minorities of the equal education for which they fought a long, hard battle. Minority students are more likely to attend urban schools where discipline problems have allowed disorder to interrupt learning. Students in predominantly minority schools are seriously attacked and robbed more than twice as often as students attending predominantly white schools.[41] In minority schools, teachers run six times the risk of being attacked.[42]

Some civil rights advocates have argued that disciplinary practices are discriminatory. The Commission on Civil Rights during the Carter Administration noted that "differences in culture, lifestyle, and experiences in a white-dominated society" make it unfair to punish minority students for "institutionally inappropriate behavior."[43]

This is exactly wrong. The *failure* to discipline creates an obstacle to learning, especially in minority schools. To allow poor discipline to continue its negative effects is anti-minority. Depriving children of a chance for education is depriving them of their future. Teaching them that criminal behavior is acceptable further diminishes their chances for advancement.

The importance of discipline to education influences the decision of many parents to enroll their children in private schools. According to the Secretary of Education's report to Congress on the financing of private elementary and secondary education, 87.1 percent of the parents surveyed considered discipline a very important factor in choosing their children's private schools.[44] But not everyone can afford to finance their children's education. Parents need not be required to pay private school tuition in order to afford their children the superior education a well-disciplined school can provide. As George McKenna of Washington High has demonstrated, turbulent public schools can be turned around. Order can be restored by establishing a structured environment where students know what is expected of them and where they know the consequences of their actions if they misbehave. This requires the fair and consistent enforcement of rules that are understood and known by the students.

In response to these problems, this Administration has undertaken a school discipline initiative. It consists of Presidential leadership drawing national attention to the problems of school discipline and violence, with supporting actions by the Departments of Education and Justice. President Reagan has met with educators and state and local government officials and has directed the Departments of Education and Justice to support their efforts to restore an orderly, effective learning environment to public schools—but without interfering with management and policy discretion on the state and local level. The federal role has been designed to complement and defend the efforts of principals, teachers, parents and students in establishing a basis for achievement in their schools, rather than to create another series of costly and cumbersome programs.

President Reagan has, for instance, requested the Department of Justice to file "friend of the court" briefs when appropriate in cases involving school discipline. The Department's efforts in such cases are geared toward protecting the authority of teachers, principals and school administrators in responding to school discipline problems.

As another example, the Departments of Education and Justice have coordinated their efforts to establish a National School Safety Center, which functions chiefly in the collection and dissemination of data. The Center gathers and analyses information on school safety and crime prevention techniques and legal information regarding school discipline. The Center will also develop a computerized national clearinghouse for school safety resources, and publish materials advising principals, teachers and parents of their legal rights in dealing with disruptive students, and of successful approaches to discipline problems. The Center will also recognize outstanding school safety leaders across the country.

The Department of Education will focus its attention on the prevention of school violence by evaluating activities currently underway in local school districts, and identifying how local jurisdictions can effectively reduce school crime. In addition, the Department will examine the crime and discipline records of individual schools when selecting the award recipients in the Secretary's Exemplary Elementary and Secondary School Competition. The Department is also prepared to sponsor regional hearings on school discipline in an attempt to seek possible solutions to discipline problems and to highlight local success stories.

The federal government, then, will do what it can to make sure that state and local officials have the tools—the information and authority—they need to design the best disciplinary standards they can and then implement them. But federalism dictates that the ultimate success of this effort depends on whether state and local jurisdictions accept their responsibility to restore discipline to the public schools. This will require resolution and commitment, not money.

For many—most—the realization of the American dream hinges in large part on receiving a good education in a safe and orderly environment. As President Reagan has said:

> We must teach our sons and daughters a proper respect for academic standards, for codes of civilized behavior and for knowledge itself, not for the sake of those standards, not for the sake of those codes, not even for the sake of that knowledge, but for the sake of those young human beings.[45]

Notes

1. James C. Enochs, "A Modest Proposal To Restore Educational Standards," *Education Week*, December 21, 1981, p. 18.

2. Gerald Grant, "Children's Rights and Adult Confusions," *The Public Interest*, Fall, 1982, p. 92.
3. *Phi Delta Kappan*, "The 14th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools," 1982.
4. "The National Household Survey on Drug Abuse," National Institute on Drug Abuse, in *Parade* magazine, March 4, 1984.
5. Jackson Toby, "Crime in School and Crime in the Community: Is There a Causal Connection?" presented at a meeting of the American Society of Criminology, November 12, 1983.
6. *Wood v. Strickland*, 420 U.S. 308, 322, (1975).
7. *Goss v. Lopez*, 419 U.S. 565 (1975).
8. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education, *Violent Schools—Safe Schools: The Safe School Study Report to Congress*, Volume I (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978), p. 8.
9. Ibid., p. 38.
10. Boston Safe Schools Commission, *Making Our Schools Safer for Learning: The Report of the Boston Commission on Safe Public Schools*, November, 1983.
11. Jackson Toby, "Violence in School," *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*, Volume 4, University of Chicago Press, 1983.
12. For instance, a follow-up paper written in 1983 by Oliver C. Moles of NIE concluded that the most recent figures "contradict the notion of a progressive worsening of the school crime problem" since the 1978 study. [Oliver C. Moles, "Trends in Interpersonal Crimes in Schools" (based on a paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada, April, 1983), September 12, 1933.] Moles conceded a slight increase in the number of assaults on students and teachers but contended that, overall, crime against individuals is not getting any worse. But even if Moles is correct in his analysis of figures which he admits are "very conservative estimates," he and his analysis do not indicate that there has been any improvement either.
13. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (NIE), p. 50.
14. Ibid., p. 50.
15. Ibid., p. 50.
16. Ibid., p. 75.
17. Ibid., p. 47.
18. Ibid., p. 48.
19. Ibid., p. 32.
20. Ibid., p. 98.
21. Ibid., p. 46.
22. Ibid., p. 47.
23. Boston Safe Schools Commission, p. 16.
24. Ibid., p. 29.
25. Ibid., p. 13.

26. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (NIE), p. 64.
27. Ibid., p. 75.
28. Boston Safe Schools Commission, p. 12
29. Ibid., p. 13.
30. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (NIE), p. 64.
31. *Wall Street Journal*, July 9, 1981.
32. Jackson Toby, November 12, 1983 speech.
33. James McPartland and Edward McDill, editors, "Positions of Education Organizations," in *Violence in Schools*, (Lexington Books: Lexington, Mass., 1977), p. 104.
34. Boston Safe Schools Commission, p. 14.
35. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (NIE), p. iv.
36. *Time*, April 25, 1983.
37. Los Angeles *Herald Examiner*, editorial, "The News Isn't All Bad: One School's Success Story," October 27, 1983.
38. Ronald Reagan, speech delivered at the 68th Annual Convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Las Vegas, Nevada, February 7, 1984.
39. Working Group on School Violence and Discipline, memorandum to the Cabinet Council on Human Resources, January 1984.
40. CCHR Working Group, January 1984.
41. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (NIE), p. 110.
42. Ibid., p. 111.
43. CCHR Working Group, January 1984.
44. Ibid.
45 Ronald Reagan, February 7, 1984.

FOUR

The Training of Teachers: A Dubious Record

James W. LoGerfo

Although educational reform is currently very much on the public mind, not enough attention has been paid to what may be the most important component in any attempt at successful and productive reform: the training of teachers.

No matter how many recommendations are implemented, no matter how much money is dedicated to educational reform, the core of the crisis will remain until there are thoughtful, substantive reforms in this area. This problem is not new, nor has it gone unnoticed. Gilbert Highet, the noted Columbia classicist and author of *The Art of Teaching*, is supposed to have remarked more than thirty years ago that West 120th Street in Manhattan was the widest street in the world: it separated the main part of Columbia's campus, with its traditional science and humanities departments, from Teachers College.

Highet's observation was made before the intense changes in educational finance, organization, and student attitudes that took place in the sixties and seventies which brought about a significant change in the nature of the very people who entered the teaching profession. During this period there were massive infusions of federal money into state educational systems, which led to, *inter alia*, a general reduction in the student-teacher ratio and a consequent, almost desperate need for many more teachers.

Initially, the problem was not acute. The lure of membership in a fairly respectable but low paid profession, and in the case of male students, a means to postpone or avoid conscription, helped to fill most of the newly created teacher vacancies. The commitment and qualifications of many of these teachers was naturally questionable. To compound the problem, the waning of the idealism of the sixties created a climate where students once again found the pursuit of money acceptable. Men and women who once considered entering social work, teaching, the Peace Corps, or spending several years travelling around the country to "find themselves" were now filling business management and pre-law programs. A small group of students continued, and still continue, to enroll in traditional liberal arts courses in pursuit of broad culture and learning. Still later, computer science departments, offering students genuine assurances of lucrative careers after graduation, absorbed most of the more intelligent and ambitious students and, as a result, administered the *coup de grace* to any remaining hope for attracting students of high caliber to established education departments.

It is therefore not surprising that the pool of students planning to enter teaching is today deplorably small, and many lack the intellectual equipment to engender continuing faith in the teaching profession. In New Jersey, the state on which this study will focus, 57% of students entering undergraduate education programs scored below 400 on the verbal portion of the Scholastic Aptitude Test. Only 43% of students enrolling in all other programs scored below 400 on the SAT. The scores of future teachers on the math portion of the test are no less revealing: 47% of them scored below 400, while only 35% of students with other intentions did so. Only one percent of the education majors scored above 600 on the verbal portion, against seven percent of students contemplating other fields.[1]

This unwelcome phenomenon, interestingly enough is not confined to undergraduate students of education. At the end of a three year, nation-wide scrutiny of Graduate Record Examination scores, the Educational Testing Service, the administrators of the GRE found that the average verbal scores of students wishing to do graduate work in education were lower than those in all but four of the 92 fields covered by the test. Graduate education students, for example, achieved an average score of 440 on the verbal portion; the average of students entering graduate English programs was 587.[2]

Not all students entering undergraduate education programs, however, graduate in the bottom quarter of their high school class. And this, ultimately, is a source of hope. Despite low salaries, low status (a recent phenomenon), excessive paperwork, and the relatively new—and proper—movement toward accountability, there are still people who want to teach, and who possess the intellectual ability, commitment, creativity, and personality needed for success. There is a high degree of satisfaction derived from bringing children from point A to point B on a scale of intellectual achievement, in seeing children grow in skills, self-confidence, and critical thinking ability.

It is not uncommon, in fact, for people with established, but perhaps unsatisfactory, careers to want to begin anew as teachers. This trend seems to be increasing and could well provide a quick, partial amelioration of the real crisis in education.

For those aspirant teachers, whether recent college graduates or older adults changing careers, a teaching position can still be found today without too much difficulty, albeit with below average salaries, at a private or parochial school. If these schools did not have palpably finite sources of funding, they might be considered malicious explciters of idealistic men and women. Although most private schools are unable to pay salaries commensurate with those in the public sector, there are some prosperous, well-endowed, and well-known schools (including not a few with overt religious affiliation) which, thanks to upper class student bodies, can match the public school salary schedules. Most cannot.

Intellectual idealism aside, teachers are willing to accept sub-standard compensation—and sometimes extra responsibilities in private schools because of the prospect of working with more intelligent, highly motivated students, a smaller bureaucratic maze, and, above all, no obligation to possess the usual credentials, a license or certificate granted by the state education department. This document provides the entree to the public school system and it presupposes completion of a possibly lengthy sequence of education courses. A teacher in a private school need never have taken so much as a single education course; the overwhelming majority of private school teachers have subject area majors within the context of a broad liberal arts course of study. Many observers, including not a few parents, consider the predominantly liberal arts education of these teachers an asset and a significant factor contributing to the high reputation private schools enjoy.

This problem is particularly acute for the older aspirant teachers. Adults intent on exchanging an established career for one in teaching will, after weighing all considerations, invariably opt to teach in a public school, principally to avoid an unwelcome diminution of income. But to do so requires a teaching license or certificate.

As a means of highlighting a fundamental cause of the current crisis in education, it might be beneficial to examine the program of studies required to obtain a teaching certificate. The New Jersey system will be used here as a typical example. The state has a high level of prosperity, some of its counties have the highest per capita incomes in the nation, its school districts spend generously on education—and the state expenditure per pupil, at $4,190, is the third highest in the nation.[3] The state is also close to the cultural mecca of New York City. Its population is highly educated and its taxpayers, regardless of income, are concerned with the quality of education; this is especially true in the wealthier suburbs, where well-paid professionals are willing to pay a premium for high quality public education. As a result, the average class size in the state is 16; the national average is 18. New Jersey has a relatively small and accessible education bureaucracy and its regulations pertaining to certification are not too ponderous. Education programs are available at most of its private colleges and at six of its eight public colleges.

New Jersey currently requires its teachers to have studied a basic minimum of five three-credit courses: Educational Psychology, two courses in the teaching of reading, one course from a broad category called Human and Intercultural Relations, and an elective such as Introduction to Education.

The only people who can benefit from this minimum are those who have a bachelor's degree and have already acquired some teaching experience in a non-public school, or those who enter little known programs at the state's two largest universities. An undergraduate student, however, who enters college with the intention of acquiring the certificate through an education major must take a minimum of 55 credits in education courses. (The number could increase to 71 required credits, depending on the specialization). These forty credits beyond the minimum mandated by the state are a requirement of the college's education division. College graduates returning to college only for the certificate, and who have had no teaching experience whatever, are also constrained to take 43 credits in education, no matter how intense their concentration in a subject field, no matter how sound the reputation of their college.

The reason candidate teachers find themselves compelled to more than double their exposure to education courses is the requirement for them to serve as a student teacher. The state merely requires the experience; in practice, arrangements to serve as a student teacher in a public school can only be made through a college with a recognized education program. It is this monopoly that endows the college with the privilege to design an education program as it wishes. This is, in essence, the tie that binds aspirant teachers, whether degree holders or not, to college education departments. It is very difficult to circumvent this monopoly; it can be minimized: only Rutgers, the more selective state university, and Fairleigh Dickinson University will sponsor a student teacher who has completed only the state's minimum 15 credit requirement, but this mitigation applies to candidates who already hold degrees.

A candidate who not only has a degree but also at least three years of full-time teaching experience, at a private or parochial school or at the college level, is exempt from the student teaching requirement, provided he works directly through the state education department. Thus, the eight weeks of student teaching are decreed by the state to equal three years of teaching without the benefit of a faculty mentor to pilot the novice through the shoals of one's first teaching experience. It is true that a faculty mentor can be useful, by helping the new teacher to prepare the all important lesson plans, to fill out the plethora of forms required at all levels of the education establishment, and, more importantly, how to adjust technique to individual classes or individual students or to resolve discrete personality problems. Whether or not this can be done adequately within eight weeks is another question.

All of these requirements are enforced inflexibly: despite the acknowledged shortage of science teachers, for example, the state education department's certification division recently refused to grant a certificate to a Scotswoman who had completed three of the five required education courses, had extensive teaching experience, and had completed over 100 credit hours in her science specialization. The woman obviously had both a desire to teach and the requisite academic credentials, but, not being able to satisfy adamantine requirements, she was forced to abandon the profession she practiced so well in the United Kingdom.

Although student teaching is required for those without previous teaching experience, the length of one's assignment as a student teacher is not uniform. It is not uncommon to hear of a student teaching assignment lasting only five weeks. Thus the length of what is probably the most beneficial component of the teacher training program is dependent on the whims of the faculty mentor or the sponsoring classroom teacher.

One undeniable benefit of the student teaching system is the potential for detecting a candidate who is ill-suited to classroom teaching. An education major may have done well in his or her course work, and may even have prepared superlative lesson plans, but may have retained little from the former and may implement the latter incoherently; he may be irascible, overly sensitive, or generally unable to conduct a class successfully. This potential for weeding out the truly unqualified is rarely exercised. The shortage of teachers in many subject areas, the laxness of many mentors, the hope that the inept candidate will bloom late, if given one or two more years of actual classroom experience, and the reluctance to halt a career in which so much has already been invested, all conspire to obviate what should be a very natural process.

The Program

Once having decided to become a teacher, what is the program the prospective teacher must face? Actual recent experiences will be used to weigh the value of the typical minimum program. The actual college will go unnamed, but, because there is very little variation in the nature of the programs and the credentials of the faculty teaching the courses, it could very well serve as a composite of all six state colleges which offer education programs. (It is also not atypical in its offering of graduate credit for summer programs devoted to the study of the geology of Hawaii or to "an extensive camping and canoeing experience in northern Ontario").

As in many state colleges, the number of adults enrolled as matriculated students is astonishingly high. These students must first endure the bureaucratic rigors of waiting for signatures and attending boring and often patronizing counseling sessions with faculty advisors. Since many of the advisees are people who have given up existing careers in order to become teachers, their level of commitment is high and they have mature personality traits. It is unfortunate that this is their first encounter with the educational establishment. That they can overcome these obstacles is a testimony to the strength of their commitment.

A common complaint among novice teachers is that there was little correlation between the content of their courses and the classroom situations they encountered during their first years of teaching. This is not a case of the traditional disparity between theory and application; it concerns, rather, the actual subject matter that is taught. Why weren't the courses useful? Should they not be intended to proffer practical advice? Have the courses and overall curricula for teachers changed over the years? Do they reflect the legitimate concerns of scholarly observers of education? If the curricula do not change much from year to year, does actual course content change? Is there a connection between the description of a course in the college's catalogue and the actual presentation of the course? These and other questions can be answered by a careful examination of a typical and traditional teacher training program.

In any such discussion, it is useful to remember that every student, regardless of the institution or program, is likely to encounter one or two poor instructors in the course of a college career. But when the number of unsatisfactory courses nearly equals the number of courses studied, there is an intrinsic problem not only with the instructors, but with the program as well. This was the experience of a group of students who enrolled in education courses at this college during the academic year 1982-83.

All of the students interviewed had at least one degree before entering the education program and were comparing the instructors in the program with college professors in traditional liberal arts disciplines.

Each undergraduate education student at this college is required to register for between 55 and 71 credit hours, depending on the specialization; this is in addition to 36 credits in general education (liberal arts), to be chosen from subject area groups, that is, social sciences, arts, natural sciences, humanities.

The courses that will be examined constitute the minimum prescribed by the state: Educational Psychology, two courses in the teaching of reading, a course in Human and Intercultural Relations, and an elective.

Educational Psychology

The not very felicitously phrased catalogue description for educational psychology notes that the student will be exposed to an "analysis of learning theory and its application. Considers cognition, motivation, tests and measurements." This is the only course of the required five that could be considered preparation for actual classroom experience.

In several sections of this course, offered in both day and evening sessions, each with different instructors during the academic year 1982-83, there was in fact a serious disparity between the catalogue description and the actual conduct of the class. Each instructor appeared to be somewhat eccentric. Educational psychology is a fully independent department at this college (as it is at most colleges with education programs), and not in any way connected to the Psychology Department; its instructors are required, whether full time members of the college faculty or adjunct instructors, to possess at least a Master's degree in the field. But this is no guarantee that the catalogue description will be implemented. One student told of a professor who assigned no textbook (something not inherently ill-advised) or any other reading material for the course, because, he said, no text would include all the most current data or the variety of topics he wanted to cover.

From the beginning, however, his lectures depended on research and analyses that were published and discussed as far back as 15-20 years ago: principally those of the Romantic Critics. They provided the philosophical underpinning for his lectures. They were his reference, his touchstone, his source for authority and legitimacy. This is not the place to discuss the merits of the group's critique of education, but a summary would be in order, especially since this man was not the only one at the college propounding their views. The group includes Paul Goodman, whose book, *Compulsory Mis-Education*, is the centerpiece of the genre; *Coming of Age in America* by Edgar Friedenberg, *How Children Fail* by John Holt, *The Greening of America* by Charles Reich are other books in this group.[4] The gravamen of their complaint was that schools create an atmosphere suffused by control, distrust, and the constant threat of punishment. Children are bored because of poor teaching techniques, they are confused because they are not taught how to think, they are afraid because they think they will not get from education what they think they should get. Schools, in short, are more concerned with indoctrination than with thinking.

The experimental systems that these authors suggested as alternatives to the authoritarian, traditional schools, have either failed or been marginally successful. Their lack of success may have derived from excessive idealism and not enough practical appreciation of human nature. The impracticality of the experiments did not *eo ipso* provide a defense for the genuine weaknesses of the traditional schools, but attempting to prepare future teachers for the classroom with only this idealism as a buttress is an exercise in folly.

With the Romantics as his intellectual armour, this particular instructor proceeded to maintain repeatedly that the main goal of education is to improve the self-image of the student, and that teachers should not set unattainable goals. Not a few parents might think that education has as its purpose the imparting of skills, the development of critical thinking processes, and the acquisition of the substance of one's cultural heritage. Not so, according to this educational psychologist. Whatever skills are acquired should be through the Mastery-Learning theory of Benjamin Bloom, which contends that all children are capable of learning, but they should not be graded on how much they have learned; they should be judged instead by how long they take to learn. A full class is exposed to new material; the brighter students will master it quickly and then stop to help their weaker mates learn the material. The class does not progress until all students have learned the material. By the end of the year, not very much learning will have taken place. The system does give the student the feeling that something, however little, has been learned; and the teacher who, as part of a group that was criticized by the Romantics for having very low expectations for students, can now derive satisfaction from knowing that even the poorest student has learned something.[5]

In addition, a good teacher will try to understand why children misbehave rather than demonstrate how to behave. This can be achieved by taking a real interest in the students by knowing their birthdays, personal problems, hobbies and interests, and by using the students' own form of communication, instead of setting a higher cultural norm to which all students should strive. Every student should leave each lesson with some degree of self-esteem, even if some insignificant fact is all he can remember.

There is a related concept, called the "Pygmalion Effect," after the mythical Greek sculptor Pygmalion who created a perfect statue, Galatea, which came to life. To educational psychologists, this means that if a teacher will treat all students as candidates for learning, they will learn. Advocates of this theory like to allude to Shaw's version of the Pygmalion story by pointing to Eliza Doolittle's claim that the difference between a lady and a flower girl is the way she is treated. Therefore if each student is treated as if he were Einstein, he could master the intricacies of physics with great facility. Even to learn simple arithmetic, however, a flower girl will have to have a flexible mind, industry, interest, patience, and some degree of ambition, as well as that attribute denied in fashionable education circles: native intelligence.

Ironically, most of this instructor's lectures were delivered in dogmatic fashion: each of his tenets was repeated over and over again and no deviation from a prepared formulation was permitted. He certainly had not learned from the Romantic Critics even though their thought formed the substance of his beliefs. His two tests in the course each consisted of ten short answer questions. On the session before each test, he rehearsed the questions and their answers with the class so test answers would perfectly mirror his formulations. Only chronic absenteeism would result in a grade lower than C. As it happened, during the first test, several students had not in fact done any preparation and were openly, nay, defiantly cheating. Two students who had observed this behavior planned to bring it to the instructor's attention at the end of the next session. They did not have the opportunity.

The next session was devoted to the problem of student tensions. In the present competitive nature of schooling at all levels, the instructor observed, students could not avoid tension. Cheating, he maintained, was one excellent way to relieve tension. Knowing that one can cheat and not be punished for it will make students less anxious and more willing to keep coming to school and tolerating the otherwise intolerable authoritarian nature of education. Similarly, he discouraged teachers from assigning homework before a week-end and certainly never before a holiday.

This desire to have a child avoid failure may be an unimpeachably idealistic goal, but it is certainly not helpful as preparation for life in the adult world at the end of formal schooling. A child should experience occasional failure, partly as an exercise in maturation, partly as an incentive for further achievement.

This same instructor did not return his mid-term examination until two weeks before the end of the term (a traditional complaint of students through the ages), which contradicted his many admonitions to his students to remember the need of their own pupils for frequent assessments of the quality of their work in class. His one written assignment, a three page critique of virtually any book touching on education, would not, alas, be graded, but only contain a check mark, indicating they were submitted. The check mark was in his grade book; the actual papers were never returned to the students, denying students an appraisal of their critical evaluation skills. This probably didn't make a difference in any case, because he encouraged students merely to read in order to obtain the principal message of the book. If this could be done by reading the first and last chapters, that was acceptable to him. He wanted students merely to hold a book on education in their hands, however briefly. If future teachers did not have to be subjected to a rigorous analytical exercise in one of the key courses in their program, would they be likely to ask their own students, in the fullness of time, to do so?

Education and Social Change

Propagating the tenets of the Romantic Critics was not confined to Educational Psychology. A course within the category of Human and Intercultural Relations, called Education and Social Change, was taught by another of its champions. This is a course whose very title implied a vital connection between education and change in society, and should have been filled with the potential for discussing and defending theoretical positions on the social role of education. The instructor seemed an apt selection for teaching the course: he was a high ranking college administrator who would naturally be familiar with the latest developments in the social standing of education as perceived and interpreted by political interests and the machinations of politicians at all levels of government. He would presumably be aware of current proposals for reform or innovative teaching concepts. Instead, the hoary theses of the Romantic Critics were again adduced, buttressed by an occasional two sentence summary of historical attitudes toward education. When an instructor has too many other, non-teaching burdens, it is difficult to keep current in his field, and there is a natural tendency to rely on antiquated college notes or the memory of graduate school lectures as source materials.

Another leitmotiv, expressed repeatedly in a two sentence format, was a disquisition on the power and influence of the press (the education editor of the only state-wide newspaper in particular) on education. This rather diaphanous lecture material was supplemented by films produced twenty years ago that were intended to elucidate educational techniques and problems current at the time the films were made. These film selections should not have been too surprising, coming from a partisan of the somewhat archaic, if not wholly discredited, Romantic Critics. The course was, in short, neither a history of education nor an examination of contemporary problems, reforms, or goals. Students were treated to a light melange of nostrums, current events, and common sense.

There was never an attempt to instill any degree of professionalism into the course. This would have been difficult in any case, since the instructor, as a high level administrator in the college, was frequently absent from class because he was attending or conducting meetings on campus or attending meetings or testifying before committees of the state legislature. Students became as familiar with the department chairman, who announced absences or anticipated tardiness, as with the absent or tardy instructor. Of the fifteen weekly sessions, he was absent from seven, late for all the others. Most of the sessions that he conducted lasted little more than an hour (of the scheduled two hours and thirty minutes). When his time in class was not devoted to his recurring leitmotivs, he supervised the viewing of video tapes of his interviews with people concerned with education, principally other members of the college faculty (although, to his credit, he did have two twenty minute interviews with the *Star-Ledger* Education Editor).

The principal student requirement in this class was a paper on a topical issue in education, such as sex education, student suicides, the shortage of athletic coaches and math teachers, or similar topics. Each student also had to present an oral summary of his research before his classmates at the end of the term. Each presentation was originally scheduled to last fifteen to twenty minutes during the last two or three sessions of the term. Because of the instructor's many absences, only two sessions remained in which the presentations could be fit, which meant they had perforce to last ten minutes each.

During the second half of the first of these sessions, however, the instructor, emitting an air of masterly insouciance, permitted the importunate president of the college's faculty union to present his membership's argument for an increase in the state sales tax, which would permit more state money to be spent on faculty salaries. The union leader followed his unscheduled presentation with a request to the students to write form letters to their state legislators urging the increase. As it happened, he came with a generous supply of form letters, envelopes, postage stamps, and lists of the names and addresses of the legislators. He even offered to determine which legislator served which students in the event students did not already know the appropriate names. Without hearing any opposing views, students were under moral pressure to write the letters in the prescribed manner and submit them, properly addressed, into a box carried by the union president as he went from student to student.

In the end, students could derive dubious satisfaction from having participated in partisan political activity that had as its issue a one percent increase in the state sales tax.

This loss of time (and possible violation of student consciences), absorbed the entire remainder of that session, which left only one session into which all the remaining oral presentations had to be squeezed. And squeezed they were. Students were compelled to rumble through a 3-5 minute oral precis of a 10 page paper in a nervous, almost incoherent manner. The educational benefits to students listening to their peers' research was difficult to discern.

To accommodate all the students, this last session lasted well beyond the allotted 2½ hours; and the instructor, in the final minutes of the term, admitted ruefully that he had not achieved all that he had wanted to achieve during the semester. Amen!

Reading

New Jersey has a requirement that all applicants for a teaching certificate must first successfully complete two courses in how to help students improve their reading skills (an attempted solution addressed in the mid-seventies to the newly perceived problem of student illiteracy). One of the courses is Foundations in Content Reading: Secondary

(Elementary) and the other on Teaching Reading in the Secondary (Elementary) School. This two course sequence provoked the most animated comments from students who either were enrolled in the courses or who had completed them. Most admitted the potential for good was inherent in the sequence, but they also agreed that the material could easily have been condensed into a one semester course without measurable harm. The selection of texts for the two courses assuredly supports this conclusion: the text for the first course was entitled *Reading Strategies for Middle and Secondary School Teachers*, and *Reading Instruction in the Secondary School* was the other. Indeed, one teacher in the department admitted that the reading requirement was initially advocated as a means to provide work for reading specialists, which would also have the salutary coincidental effect of enhancing every teacher's ability to raise the reading level of his or her pupils.

Only one of the several reading instructors on the undergraduate level (the college also has graduate level professors in a program offering advanced degrees in reading) evaluated by students in this survey was able to conduct a reasonably successful course, and also came close to measuring up to standards that would approximate the competence one would expect from an instructor in a liberal arts subject. This person who taught Foundations in Content Reading, had a well-organized syllabus, which was adhered to throughout the semester, and was able to maintain control over the class.

Because of the technical nature of the subject, borrowing from physiology, psychology, biology, and other areas, there was scant room for fatuous comments from the teacher or ill-formed opinions from the students. The two exams were composed exclusively of 100 multiple choice questions which may or may not have been educationally justifiable. Indeed, the instructor was so conscientious that the material presented was sometimes overwhelmingly oppressive and some of the discerning students thought there was a lack of discrimination in the preparation of the lectures; the material seemed to have been gathered, almost promiscuously, from the instructor's own graduate student career.

There was an attempt to offset this by approaching each topic from several different avenues, something that most of the other instructors were unable to do, regardless of subject. Although a grading scale was used, high grades were not easily or automatically attained. Unlike most of the other instructors in the education program, this one refrained from waxing autobiographical during each session as a substitute for unprepared lecture material. Many tend to consume the bulk of a session with detailed descriptions of youthful adventures, divorce proceedings, surgical operations, stress (this derives mainly from the fear that their jobs will be abolished), hobbies, and other interests.

In general, each session in this instructor's course lasted about one and one half hours, out of a possible two and one half hours. Although standing out from all others in the department, the instructor had other shortcomings which will be discussed later.

Another teacher of this subject was unable to prepare his lectures conscientiously; nor did he seem to want to hold his students for more than half of each scheduled session. He was indifferent and desultory in his lecture style. He did, however, have a decent general education and thus his ramblings were not entirely lost on at least a few of his better educated students. A good portion of class time was devoted to promoting his own consulting firm, which specialized in—not reading, oddly enough, but stress control—something he apparently did not require himself as a result of his academic labors. It would be difficult, in short, to claim that the foundations of reading techniques were taught in his class.

Yet another instructor in this department, giving a course on the Teaching of Reading in the Secondary Schools was an unmitigated disaster for students, the department, and the institution itself. Students in her classes would perforce form such unfavorable, indeed hostile views of the college that unavoidably their views would be broadcast widely.

This instructor routinely came into class 20-30 minutes late and during class would make frequent trips back to her office to fetch some forgotten but inevitably useless materials. She always arrived with a large cup of coffee in one hand and a cigarette in the other (and smoked several more during the session) despite the presence of three printed signs expressly forbidding both drinking and smoking.

There was very little lecturing or useful discussion. Two full sessions, for example, were devoted to a clumsy demonstration of an intelligence test used to determine capability for auditory discrimination. She did not explain the significance of the test, nor did she attempt to put it in a context. She did maintain, however, that most teachers in the public schools will typically *not* have occasion to use it. Students inevitably left each session with a feeling of benumbed helplessness. Other sessions were ill-prepared, devoted to rambling digressions or discussions having very little to do with her syllabus. This was justified because, she claimed, the assigned text was so thorough there was scant more she could add to enhance it during class. Two short meetings were devoted to discussions of the contemporary state of education, with her reflections on the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education as the centerpiece. She merely disagreed with its conclusions (in an attitude of unrelenting hostility), but acknowledged, then and frequently throughout the course, the poor state of literacy among high school and college seniors. She herself contributed nothing to the amelioration of that problem. At the end of the semester, her students were no more able to increase the reading abilities of their future pupils than when they first entered her classroom.

After a demonstration of another intelligence test, comprising 100 multiple choice vocabulary questions, and given to class members so they could determine for themselves the level of difficulty of currently tested vocabulary words, she went over the answers using a poorly hidden dictionary, indicating her own lack of mastery of 100 not too esoteric words; she even mispronounced many of them.

Given the nature of a course treating of literacy, even feigning mastery of the material would have been an intellectual imperative. A teacher uncertain of vocabulary might have discreetly marked a copy of an answer sheet in order to avoid undermining her credibility. There were enough similar instances that by the end of the term her authority was in shreds and her credibility irretrievably lost.

When her mid-term examination, consisting of 100 objective questions, was returned, some of the more alert students in the class realized that between 9 and 13 questions that had been marked wrong were actually correct. One true-false question had stated that "the word 'base' had only one meaning." Only students who had marked that statement as true received credit. With this obvious incentive, more students quickly began noticing other mismarked answers. The instructor would not countenance appeals to discuss the disputed answers and, regrettably, made no effort to re-grade the examination.

Unwilling to discern the unprofessionalism of her behavior, she remained obdurate. Her justification, she explained, was based on the excessive amount of time she had already devoted to grading the examination. She couldn't possibly do more. When students themselves became adamant, because of the obvious justice of their case, she only expanded on her rationalization and explained her grading process. She admitted spending only one half-hour grading the exam by use of a key. Four more hours, however, were spent analyzing the results. She had determined how many students chose the wrong answer for each question, and, in the case of the multiple choice questions, how many students picked each of the five possible choices. This effort was made, she allowed, so she would know whether or not the questions were apt for that particular course in the future.

Most teachers would know when they were preparing an examination if they had in fact covered in class the material to be included on the test and they would by mid-term have an approximate appreciation of the intellectual capabilities of most class members. After carefully explaining this process, called "item analysis," the instructor admitted that she would in any case use the same test the next semester, an admission only partly induced by anger provoked by the challenges to the validity of her questions. She also apparently hoped that this explanation would appease irate students and justify her unwillingness to revise the grades on the tainted examination.

Having sensed an obvious and forceful reluctance of so many students to accept her position (including all the students who already held degrees and whom she may have considered her intellectual peers), she grudgingly offered a qualified concession: only students who provided documented proof of the grading errors would be eligible for a change of grade and only if the written evidence were submitted within one week. The grades of all the remaining students who had erroneous grades would thus not be changed.

A large portion of the class was so grateful that the grades were scaled that they were more than content with whatever grades they had received and proceeded to do nothing. This was more a testimony to the lack of incentive they had to prepare adequately before the exam than mere post-exam lassitude.

(Several of these students later criticized the "complainers" for not appreciating what the instructor did for them in scaling the grades, an indication that this instructor's classroom style was probably more typical of other education faculty than one would like to think, and that any redeeming feature, such as scaling of grades, could be considered an unadulterated boon.)

The instructor's calculated concession was successful: only five students accepted the challenge of preparing the needed documentation. For a teacher whose nine hour per week class schedule required her to be on the college campus only two nights each week, from 5:00 to 10:10 on Tuesdays and Thursdays, it is difficult to sympathize with her refusal to accept an intellectually equitable solution. She may have had other daily obligations, but they should have been subordinated to her full-time job. Academically defensible efforts like reviewing errors in a palpably defective test should have been as important as the obligatory committee meetings, grading of papers, student conferences, etc., that may consume part of a faculty member's day. She certainly did not spend much time preparing for class meetings.

From the mid-term onward, this teacher averaged only 50 minutes in class per week and that time was devoted to discussions of current events, proposals to improve the quality of education (including the defense of the practice of granting college credit for remedial courses undertaken by ill-prepared students), and listening to her bilious comments on "the system." No more attempts were made to impart techniques for teaching reading. It was as if she had been intellectually intimidated by her students and, indeed, at least seven of the 33 students already possessed advanced degrees in traditional academic subjects and all of the other adult students already held bachelor's degrees; all were ambitious, highly motivated people, eager to enter the teaching profession despite the obstacles. Rather than say anything that might provoke challenge, it was better to say nothing. An instructor with proven expertise in a field should have no difficulty maintaining control over a class for the full length of the prescribed contact hours. Either the instructor was not fully mistress of the material or the subject did not merit a full semester's treatment.

Can any administrator or partisan of the status quo defend such a course? Even if somewhere in the state the course is being taught productively, what can be said to assuage the wrath of 33 students who gained little from an entire semester?

What was most unfortunate about this particular course was that it not only fell woefully short of the goal expressed in the catalogue description, but for students obtaining their certification directly from the state, this course also satisfied the requirement for a course in "methods" (of teaching). Fortunately, this route to certification also presupposes three years' experience teaching in non-public schools which might have provided an alternate route to gaining sufficient knowledge of how to conduct a satisfactory class.

Introduction to Education

With the need for reform in teacher preparation programs so self-evident—even before the National Commission's report—students in a college course entitled Introduction to Education were initially confronted by what appeared to be an attempt at academic overkill when they learned that the requirements for the course were exceptionally rigorous, requiring two examinations, and six separate papers. Even students accustomed to higher standards than they encountered typically at this college cavilled at the excess.

It was in truth a lot of work for a three credit undergraduate course; in the context of other education courses, it was almost bizarre. After receiving many complaints from harried students during the first few weeks of the term, the instructor relented or appeared to relent and reduced the requirements by half. Any respect one might have had for him because of his advocacy of high standards soon dissipated, however, when it was learned from students who had studied with him in previous terms that this ritual of demanding much, then succumbing to the blandishments of rebellious students was a regular, if inscrutable, practice of his.

Once the term was under way, his sessions were devoted to role playing and simulations which focused on dealing with teacher unions, parents, and racial problems. A few rather trite lectures on how to maintain pupil attention during a class, how to organize a class, engender confidence from parents rounded out the term's activities. Meanwhile, the catalogue description of the course led students to believe they were going to "consider the nature, aims, and methods of education." "Every effort made to involve participants actively, in class and out, in the theory and practice of education."

For these and other pains, this instructor, who was already a member of the college administration, was promoted at the end of the semester to a higher level position. Once again, there were students who felt the combination of anecdotes, apothegms, and simulations were an apt mainstay of their professional training. At least they did not have to watch twenty year-old inspirational films.

Some Causes of the Problem

This disparity between what was proposed by the college to be taught, and what was actually taught, is an inherently insurmountable problem. A college level instructor will frequently want to depart from the sometimes rigid formulations of the catalogue, especially if he did not write the description himself, but there is usually a creatively useful side to the deviation. To deviate so chasmically and so consistently is cause to suspect not only the professionalism and conscientiousness of the instructors, but also the relevance of the courses to the teacher education program.

Although only a handful of the courses in the education program have been examined here, there is little reason to believe, based on the titles of the remaining courses and the pattern of conduct established in the courses surveyed, that the others will offer much more learning or anything else memorably helpful to future teachers.

If course requirements are not designed and implemented to promote zeal and commitment among those who will teach them, they are probably in the program only as a concession to one or another pressure group or legislator and inserted after a short-lived, albeit heated, debate when a subject was fashionably topical. The requirement for two reading courses is one such result. The instructor in this department who confessed earlier that the two courses could beneficially be merged, also revealed that a recent proposal in the faculty senate to increase the reading requirement to three courses was motivated by a desire to maintain employment among the faculty amidst declining enrollments. These are not the conditions that should precede the adoption of course requirements, especially not on a state-wide level, and not if a scintilla of academic integrity is to be preserved.

Another important reason for the distinctly poor quality of education courses and the faculty teaching them has to do with the cultural and educational levels of those who teach them. People without a broad education and a high degree of culture cannot be expected to impart those qualities to their students who in turn cannot be expected to impart them to their pupils. Most people teaching education courses began their careers teaching in public elementary schools. Later they would obtain a master's degree in education and, in some cases, a doctorate and would qualify to join state college faculties when those colleges were primarily teacher preparation colleges—not liberal arts institutions. In the sixties the movement to increase the number of available college places to accommodate an ever increasing number of high school graduates caused states either to convert education schools into liberal arts institutions or to expand the education schools to include liberal arts programs.

Erstwhile grade school teachers, newly minted as college professors, did not have the professional training needed for serious research and scholarship, even if they were teaching liberal arts subjects like English or history. These courses would perforce be taught no more rigorously than methods courses. The original faculty—who are able to earn tenure after only three years—were retained. For their part, they retained the attitudes of public school teachers, attitudes very different from the deep scholarly thoroughness one expects from liberal arts faculty. Articles in the professional journals of education average only three pages, and their subjects, like those in teacher training program classrooms, tend to be superficial. Much ado is frequently made about very little. Original research is often ignored or repudiated viscerally. There is never an item by item refutation of the newer approaches to education: merely an asseveration that the concepts prevalent when the education instructor's own education took place are still adequate. To hear, as happened at the college during the semester under study, a graduate level instructor maintain adamantly that, regardless of the flaws detected in the current educational system by scholarly observers, he will change neither his views nor his practices, is the very epitome of unprofessionalism. Pity the students who over the years dared to challenge this professor's tenets. Pity the students who through ignorance, indolence, or docility blithely accepted those same tenets.

The values of intellectual inquiry, growth, industry, imagination, respect for sources, and tolerance that characterize liberal arts faculties are not shared by former public school teachers who through happenstance are teaching on the college level. They should in practice share those characteristics, but don't. Whatever discussion is tolerated in education courses concerns virtually meaningless topics that the professor takes as givens. Discussion is an exercise in how to discuss; it becomes an end in itself, not a means to clarify thoughts or, indeed, to formulate new thoughts.

Students in these courses unavoidably acquire many of the habits and attitudes of their professors and invariably take these with them into their own classrooms in the public schools. It is no wonder that there is boredom among contemporary high school students. A history teacher, for example, must have a thorough grasp of the subject, which can be acquired from working with serious scholars in a well designed program. While it is useful to know there are five causes of World War I, there may actually be more than five. If a teacher bases classroom discussion of this topic exclusively on an assigned text which claims there are only five causes, the teacher will not be able to evaluate them with perspective, offer imaginative interpretations, or express his points in alternate forms. On a standardized test, one should certainly know the five commonly accepted causes, but students should also know there are others to consider; they should at least know how to reason and arrive at other possible causes, and perhaps even to challenge the accepted wisdom. Someone not thoroughly trained will not be able to pursue this approach.

Since the success of education courses depends largely on the conscientiousness, education, preparation, and attitudes of the individual instructors, their own education will have to be augmented if, for some inscrutable cause, the multiplicity of required education courses is permitted to continue. If an instructor is bored or uninterested in the subject he teaches, or merely has lost the will to teach a boring or unnecessary course, that attitude will be conveyed to his students who in turn will leave college convinced their "professional" training was so much time wasted and that they merely treaded water in order to earn their certificates.

If public school teachers are to have the broad cultural education they will need to enrich their classroom teaching, their own instructors in professional training courses should also possess that same education. Fortunately, the movement to return to requiring a broad education for all college students, exemplified by New Jersey's recent imposition of a limit on the number of education courses an education major can take, coincides with the manifold inquiries into the quality of all levels of education today, and future teachers may well find themselves in the heretofore unenviable position of having to take more courses in literature, philosophy, history, and foreign languages. It might then be possible to avoid the glaring instances of cultural deficiencies that occurred so frequently at this college and doubtless continue to occur there and elsewhere.

The educational psychologist who believed that the purpose of education should be to improve the self-image of students will surely not be in the vanguard of those advocating reform. He once cheerfully, almost proudly, confessed to his class that he routinely did poorly on standardized tests; and that when he took the Graduate Record Examination he was angered by the presence of words in the verbal section of the test not found in everyday usage. He could find no reason, for example, why anyone would ever use the word claque in conversation. He certainly never used it, and thought its inclusion on the test a gross cultural imposition. He also frequently found occasion to deprecate the study of Latin, which he had to endure as a collegian, despite a growing movement to rehabilitate Latin as a means of improving study habits, logical thinking, and most importantly in view of SAT scores, vocabulary building.

There was also a reading teacher who, when using the word lackadaisical in her presentations before class, added on her own authority an extra s, producing lacksadaisical; she invariably added an extra syllable to mischievous, mischievious. (When she pronounced hyperbole as "hyper bowl" during a discussion of vocabulary building techniques, one student wit defined it as an athletic event that takes place in the last week of January). It was not uncommon to hear the word across pronounced by students and teachers alike as if it were spelled acrosst. If a higher culture is to be preserved, it will not be through the agency of people like these.

In her discussion of how properly to teach a lesson in social studies, another reading teacher described in abstract how an apparently composite civilization developed. She did not, however, realize it was a composite. The source she used even gave the civilization a nonsense name, Zinch Valley. A student naively queried her on whether or not it was a real place. She responded with firmness that it was indeed a real place. One of her astonished students, who possessed some research skills, looked into the matter thoroughly in the library and concluded that there was never a place named Zinch Valley. The teacher simply accepted her secondary source uncritically.

When discussing dyslexia, this same teacher reminded her auditors that Leonardo da Vinci was dyslexic, because his code writing seems to fit the writing pattern of acknowledged dyslexics. That not all of Leonardo's writing was in code, only those parts relating to secret designs for armaments—then, as now, highly classified information—had escaped her study. This teacher was also convinced that Jules Verne was a seventeenth century writer of science fiction; her own preferences in reading are the works of Stephen King and Sidney Sheldon, not exactly the admission one should make before undergraduates who should be steeping themselves in the great literature of their civilization. To admit that one's discretionary reading is confined to popular, sensational novels, when so many acknowledged classics have not been read implies that cultural learning has ceased for this person and is thus redolent of hypocrisy.

All of these malapropisms and cultural deficiencies among professors of education take on a somber aspect when one thinks that their students have generally come from the lowest quarter of their high school classes (67 percent with an average score under 400 on the verbal portion of the SAT) and will not themselves bring much cultural knowledge to their college experience. And if, as in the case of the courses sampled at this college, exposure to jargon or faculty autobiographical anecdotes will not provide the necessary cultural enrichment or even respect for it, how will they be obtained? The educational psychologist who ridiculed the study of Latin and boasted of his ignorance of claque is not a credit to the teaching profession, even if some of his insights on classroom behavior had merit.

If education is to do more than improve the self-image of students, the educational and cultural horizons of their teachers, and the teachers of their teachers, will have to improve. The radical, but obvious solution, and one that has been bruited about by more than one observer of the current state of education, is to require of future teachers a more general education, a full academic major, and a cap on the number of education courses in which they can enroll; the latter stipulation will in itself be an inducement to sample other fields and future teachers will share with traditional liberal arts students the joys of discovering the richness, depth, and relevance of world literature, they will develop the skill of writing a fluent, comprehensible English sentence, of maintaining a reasoned coherent argument for longer than five minutes. They will discover, *inter alia*, the advantages of travelling to places other than Las Vegas or Bermuda.

The most successful teachers are those who have acquired a love of the subject they teach, a love acquired through familiarity. Even future high school teachers, who are currently required to take 30 credits broadly distributed in their specialty, would doubtless benefit from an additional exposure to their subject as well as to related areas. Elementary teachers, from whose ranks sprung three of the teachers discussed earlier, including one of the two administrators, do not currently need an academic subject major. A teacher who only prepares a lesson from the textbook the night before it is needed—and then will use the same lesson until retirement—will not have the mastery needed to answer any but the simplest questions from students or be able to present a point creatively. Frequently a point has to be expressed as many as five times in different ways before it is fully comprehended by students. If a teacher derives his knowledge only from the text, the lesson can be taught in only one way; and insightful questions from students cannot be handled with profit to the students.

An Assessment

Teachers often complain they are not treated as professionals; law, medicine, accounting, and engineering are frequently adduced as comparisons. There is little benefit to analyzing this claim beyond reviewing the entrance and education requirements for these other professions. The claim to professionalism is based on, among other things, their having studied "professional" education courses. These do not, as has been demonstrated, possess the same rigor and depth as, say, courses in law and biology. The Graduate Record Examination scores mentioned earlier offer further insight into the merits of the teachers' claim. The nation-wide average score achieved by future graduate students of education on the verbal component was 440; the average for future lawyers was 508; for physicians, 515. The average nation-wide score on the mathematics portion for the graduate education students was 408; physicians scored 589, and civil engineers 649.[6]

The president of the New Jersey Education Association, in the course of defending them, recently described as uniform the contents and quality of the education courses offered by the state's public and private colleges. The uniformity, she claimed, is supported by a congeries of statutes and administrative decrees of the Department of Higher Education. It would not be too audacious, based on this assurance and the experiences described earlier, to extrapolate a pattern of uniform dullness, intellectual stultification, and cultural shallowness.[7] Older, better educated members of the profession will candidly admit that the plethora of education courses they took in college did not measurably affect their professional behavior. Intelligent teachers of any age or experience level are no doubt grateful for the exposure to the jargon they would later hear at in-service training sessions at their schools.

Teachers enrolled in graduate level programs to qualify for positions in school administration offer the same observation: the courses are boring, abbreviated, and generally conducted in a dogmatic style, unrepresentative of the techniques the graduate students were told to use when conducting their own classes; some professors even persist in evaluating their students on the basis of how much they have come to know about students' private lives. The research projects assigned to graduate education students are rarely much more than busy work, providing neither insight for the student nor genuine contributions to the profession.

Until this year, moreover, the state colleges in New Jersey required a 2.0 (C minus) grade point average to enter the undergraduate education programs. This is hardly what is expected of pre-law or pre-medicine students. Even a generous 70 credit education program cannot compare, in depth or quality, with three years of full-time legal training or four years of medical school needed to enter those professions. A lawyer, however much he may be a master of statutes and procedures, will not advance very far if he cannot speak coherently and persuasively before others. Even these requirements have been waived for teachers in recent years.

The fierce reluctance of organized teachers to submit themselves to, and pass, a standardized test in either a subject area or methodology speaks poorly for their comparisons with other professions; bar examinations and medical boards must be passed before one can become a lawyer or physician.

Teaching is undoubtedly a profession, but claims that it should be treated equally with the other professions, in terms of compensation and respect, cannot be sustained. Teachers should indeed enjoy public respect, however, because of their broad learning and reasoning ability. The degree of this respect will obviously be based on the amount of learning, and success in performing their mission, that is demonstrated. The professional responsibility of teachers is at once awesome and delicate, because of its formative impact on generations of discrete personalities. "Teachers," Gilbert Highet maintained in *The Art of Teaching*, "must see more, think more, and understand more than the average man and woman of the society in which they live."[8]

The Future

After this unnerving scrutiny of a current teacher preparation program, can one prophesy when a desperately needed alternative will be implemented? What would constitute a suitable program that would assure a supply of capable teachers in a society suffering from a long period of miseducation?

Most observers realize that higher salaries would contribute to a solution, but this is by no means a panacea. Opening the profession to intelligent, broadly educated liberal arts graduates, without compelling them to endure a series of frustrating education courses, would be an even more helpful remedy. A beguiling obsession with pedagogy has obscured the rightful place of subject matter.

Students might want voluntarily to enroll in a newly rigorous course in educational psychology, in order to have a purely theoretical background in how children learn. They might also want a course in the history of education, to be able to put past learning theories in perspective.

Regardless of peripheral options, subject area competence, a suitable personality, and a sense of mission should be the principal requirements.

To require a battery of education courses, even if reduced to a minimum of, say, four or five, would still have questionable value. Since the New Jersey education authorities will permit one to enter a classroom with only five education courses (New York requires only four), there must be tangible evidence that such people have not caused measurable harm to pupils in their charge. Similarly, there is no evidence that teachers with 43, 55, or 70 education credits behind them have measurably increased the quality of classroom teaching, or that there is a difference between a teacher with 70 education credits and one with only 43. If such relationships were provable, one might argue that every teacher should be required to enroll in 70, 90, or 120 credits.

Unless they are advocated by institutional and political authorities, successful reform of teacher education programs will not take place. New Jersey, the locus of this study, is moving, albeit glacially, toward reform. Even before public interest in the education crisis was provoked by the work of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, the Carnegie Foundation, and others, the New Jersey Department of Higher Education had implemented a much delayed increase into the requirements for admission into undergraduate education programs, which usually takes place in the junior year. However modest the increase may seem to be, opposition to it was strong and it will be imposed in increments. Until September 1983, the minimum grade point average was 2.0 (C minus). It will rise to 2.25 in September 1984, and finally to 2.5 (a straight C) in September 1985. While the increase is obviously not calculated to induce a prompt return of public respect, it is an admission of past folly. (Entrance requirements to graduate level programs in education were not affected by these changes. A C-plus undergraduate average is still all that is necessary; and even this can be minimized, according to admissions counselors at one of the state colleges, if the candidate can offer compensating attributes, like unusual hobbies, a lively personality, or an impressive GRE score).

Another important change in the teacher education programs is the imposition of a maximum number of education courses an education major may study. It was not uncommon for students, having determined the greater difficulty of liberal arts courses, to have enrolled in up to 90 credits of education courses. Now an education major must enroll in at least 90 credits in non-education courses, out of a minimum of 120 credits needed for graduation.[9]

Scant more improvement in admission standards can be expected until state legislators abandon their sworn devotion to the academic egalitarianism which requires that large numbers of poorly prepared, and probably uninterested, high school graduates, be allowed to attend state colleges. (A large number of parents expressing dissatisfaction with the poor quality of their teacher/employees in voting booths might generate interest among legislators.) An unwritten law of human behavior causes these students to seek out the least onerous program that will result in a degree. Until now, that program has been found in education departments.

Even these minimal improvements can be vitiated by still more grade inflation. Professors tend for their own survival to share the egalitarianism of their legislators and could easily re-evaluate their standards to make a straight C or C-plus the lowest grade obtainable in their courses. Even an English or biology professor benefits from grade inflation, since many of his students will be education majors satisfying the few mandated liberal arts requirements. "It has become very easy in this country to become a classroom teacher," observed Dr. Emily Feistritzer, author of the report on teacher status for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. "It is also very hard to get fired."[10]

In a proposal that is at once refreshingly bold and decidedly innovative, the New Jersey Commissioner of Education, Saul Cooperman, strongly supported by Governor Thomas Kean, advocated in September 1983 a means of attracting into the teaching profession intelligent, broadly educated people who already have college degrees in subject areas, but who do not want the burden and expense of enrolling in 43 credits of education courses.[11]

The plan, whose gestation predates the publication of the National Commission's report, is as simple in its design as it will be effective in its execution, and must be considered in relative terms a radical innovation. The Commissioner has proposed allowing a college graduate of any age to enter the profession by successfully passing a standardized test in a subject area and then spending a year as a teacher-intern in a participating school district. Since the student teaching component of traditional education programs is in practice more important to a future teacher than most course work, extending this component from eight weeks to a full year will increase that importance proportionately.[12]

The Kean plan would also increase the minimum state-wide starting salary for a teacher with only a bachelor's degree and no experience to $18,500 from the 1983-84 average of $13,900. (The salaries in the less populated southern part of the state significantly affect the state-wide average. A more realistic average starting salary in the northern part of the state would be $15,400.) The difference between what local districts are currently paying and the proposed minimum would come from the state treasury.[13]

As for the education courses that a future teacher would miss by pursuing the Kean-Cooperman alternative, there is not much likelihood that either the teacher or his pupils would suffer. The one year internship, with its opportunity to work with an experienced master teacher in a real classroom, is worth more than the 90 credits of education courses not a few teachers have studied. Retaining pupil interest, maintaining discipline, and developing viable techniques of pupil evaluation are not arcane subjects that can be acquired only by passing through the mystery rites of a teacher preparation program.

As was to be expected, traditional teacher lobbies, the unions, college education faculties, textbook writers and publishers, organized a political campaign to prevent the

Cooperman-Kean plan from taking effect or to mitigate its effectiveness.[14]

To placate the organized opposition, Commissioner Cooperman appointed a panel of distinguished educators, including leaders of teacher associations, to evaluate the proposals. After six months of deliberations, the panel, headed by Ernest Boyer, former U.S. Commissioner of Education and currently president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, produced a report that substantially supported the Kean/Cooperman proposals. The opposition since has appeared to lose strength and seems resigned to accepting the implementation of some degree of significant reform.[15]

Indeed, public sentiment, nourished by the unavoidable political ramifications of the education issue, may, ultimately, force concessions from the education establishment. If New Jersey enacts a successful reform of its teacher licensing laws, other states may follow, and the results for the nation will be nothing less than salutary.

A member of a learned profession—and teaching has traditionally been accounted a learned profession—should exude learning, not ostentatiously, but capably. And not only in a specific subject area but also in what may be broadly defined as the liberal arts. "The teacher who knows only biology or French," Highet observed, "is not fit to teach at all."[16] Familiarity with the commonly accepted cultural core of their civilization must continue throughout life and not end with their own commencement exercise.

Simply because a teacher's expertise may be in chemistry should not preclude fluency in the use of the English language or classroom allusions to non-science disciplines. An English teacher should exhibit mastery of great literature and a more than nodding acquaintance with scientific phenomena. Both teachers should be expected to speak clearly, behave civilly, and avoid vulgarisms. Neither teacher should be reticent about using a polysyllabic vocabulary.

To serve as models for their students, teachers must help to perpetuate what is best in their civilization and what enhances the growth of young minds. To be paladins of professionalism, they must again emulate the qualities Chaucer found in the clerk of Oxford, "gladly would he learn, and gladly would he teach."

Until teachers manifest a clear sense of their mission, the most elaborate and well-crafted attempts to improve contemporary education must ineluctably fail.

Notes

1. Robert Braun, "Future Teachers Low on College Boards," Newark *Star-Ledger*, August 14, 1983, p. 1.
2. Francis Griffith, "Teachers Are Part of the Problem," *University Bookman*, Fall, 1982, pp. 14-16.
3. Robert Braun, "Latest Study Confirms Teacher Status Declines," Newark *Star-Ledger*, August 28, 1983, p. 29.
4. Paul Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-education* (New York: Horizon Press, 1964), passim; John Holt, *How Children Fail* (New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1964), passim; Edgar Z. Friedenberg, *Coming of Age in America* (New York: Random House, 1965), passim; Charles A. Reich, *The Greening of America: How the Youth Revolution Is Trying to Make America Livable*, (New York: Random House, 1970), passim.
5. Benjamin S. Bloom, et al., *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Affective Domain* (New York: David McKay, 1964), passim; *Evaluation to Improve Learning: Human Characteristics and School Learning* (New York: Random House, 1976), passim.
6. Francis Griffith, "Teachers Are Part of the Problem," pp. 14-16.
7. Edithe Fulton, "To Strengthen Licensing," Newark *Star-Ledger*, November 27, 1983.
8. Gilbert Highet, *The Art of Teaching* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950), p. 54.
9. Author's interview with Ceil Caruso, Office of Teacher Education, New Jersey Department of Higher Education, May 11, 1984.
10. "Low Teacher Pay and Status Faulted," *New York Times*, August 24, 1983, p. A12.
11. "Commissioner Explains His Licensing Plan," Newark *Star-Ledger*, November 13, 1983, p. 43.
12. "School Chief Takes Aim at Licensing to Attract Better-Qualified Teachers," Newark *Star-Ledger*, June 5, 1983, p. 1; New Jersey Education Association Research Department, New Jersey Teacher Salary Guides, 1983-84, p. 7.
13. Ibid.
14. Robert Braun, "Schools Chief Claims Foes Resort to Dirty Tricks," Newark *Star-Ledger*, April 29, 1984, p. 1.
15. Robert Braun, "Teacher Panel Boosts Kean Licensing Reforms," Newark *Star-Ledger*, March 4, 1984, p. 48.
16. Highet, *The Art of Teaching*, p. 217.

FIVE

The Politicization of the Classroom

Marcella D. Hadeed

"Totalitarian regimes have long recognized the teacher's power to mold ideas, influence behavior, and shape belief. That is why their schools are integral parts of the government-control apparatus. . . . "

Chester E. Finn
Commentary, February 1983.

According to Chester E. Finn, "one of the abiding strengths of American education . . . is that we have not politicized the classroom, or turned teachers into propagandists, or willfully instructed our children through curricula that seek to indoctrinate."[1] For Americans, education is learning to read, to write and to compute. Education is the transmittal of knowledge of history, philosophy, literature, science and art . . . of Western culture. Students learn to reason and analyze and make judgments. According to Edwin J. DeLattre, President of St. John's College, "the first and most fundamental feature of education worthy of the name is that it promotes aspiration in the young, that is, it promotes the desire to become more and better than one is. The encouragement of aspiration depends, above all, on both intellectual and moral propagation."[2]

Quietly and ominously, however, politics is creeping into the once sacrosanct American classroom. It does not appear in the form of one more fad on an already bloated list of electives from which young groping minds must select a certain total in order to obtain their diplomas. If it were that isolated and easily identified, astute students who are hungry for substance and truth in education could avoid it. Neither is it only a distorted version of the course we once knew as U.S. Government. The politics to which I refer is an increasing presence, brought about by the implantation of dogma spun by liberal ideologues, which permeate education like a poisonous vapor. Unless immediate and courageous reforms are courageously undertaken to stop the process, the gradual politicization of the classroom instruction will have a cumulative and corruptive effect on American education that, in time, will permanently alter American society in ways that will infringe on individual freedom and our right to the pursuit of happiness.

The politicization of American education is subtle compared to a totalitarian state. The means used to achieve this end are what one might expect, however: curricula and teachers.

Evidence of this phenomenon can be seen in changes in textbooks over the last 15-20 years and the change in attitude of the largest teachers' union, the National Education Association. For example, in public school textbooks, author Frances Fitzgerald (no conservative) discovered, "there is either no past, no history at all—only 'social studies' and 'current events'—or else, a potpourri of 'pasts,' each tied to some current theme such as ethnicity, sexuality or politics."[3] Mary Futrell, President of NEA, speaking at the 1982 NEA convention (then NEA-union secretary-treasurer) said, "there's no alternative to political involvement. Instruction and professional development (of teachers) have been on the back burner to us compared to political action."[4]

In the past 15-20 years curricula in the schools have been diluted—geography and history have become "social studies," civics has become "contemporary world problems" and American Government is taught, in many cases, with biased textbooks. In one study done by Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism (CEAFU) over 200 classroom materials for high school history and government classes were reviewed. The review focused on the author's treatment of the right to work issue. According to CEAFU, of the materials reviewed, 81 discussed the right to work issue. Of those that discussed the issue, 52 (or 64%) discussed it unfairly, inaccurately, or both.[5] For example, CEAFU evaluated *The Promise of Democracy*, Graff and Bohannan; (Rand McNally, 1978) as follows:

TEXT

Breaking Tradition

. . . Unions were also set up in sections of the country that had blocked organizing in the past. For example, in several southern states, it was illegal to form a union . . ." (1) pg. 304.

End of Chapter, "People at Work," questions:
. . . Look at the labor-union song on page 278. What other evidence of the notion that there is strength in union can be found in this chapter? (2)

EVALUATION

(1) This is misinformation. Twenty states are Right to Work states which make it illegal to *force* membership in a union in order to get or maintain a job. It is completely legal in every state to "form a union."

(2) This is direct evidence of a bias. The omission of any discussion of the Right to Work issue in this chapter on "People at Work" which is 33 pages long is a not very subtle indication of the textbook's tone.

NOTE: Unexamined assumptions are the most insidious incidences of bias and the most difficult to overcome. As an integral part of the labor movement, the Right to Work issue deserves some treatment in this discussion. The provision 14(b) of the Taft Hartley Law is a critical and increasingly

> important question in labor relations and the nation's industrial history. It is the responsibility of educators and textbook publishers to present every issue in its objective entirety and to avoid becoming advocates consciously or unconsciously, for political or ideological positions.

Another example of bias in textbooks can be found in a recent study done by Robert Bryan, a Washington writer who holds a Ph.D. from the University of London in Ecclesiastical history. The study, done for *LEARN, INC.*, found that history textbooks almost totally ignore the role of religion in American life after 1700. According to Robert Bryan:

> One of the most revealing features of any historical narrative is its treatment of religion. Religion, whatever it happens to be, is always fundamental to the institutions of society; therefore, its influence is always pervasive. The customs and institutions of any society will be shaped by its members' religion—their fundamental beliefs about the nature of the world they live in and their duty towards it. Both for continuity and for historical change, it is necessary to understand these beliefs; a work is not historical, but anachronistic if it fails to place the past in the context of its fundamental beliefs.[6]

With the school curriculum thoroughly skewed, politicization of learning was inevitable. It is not that modern textbooks are without information; rather it's that the information is carefully selected and presented to create attitudes and impressions instead of systematically building toward a foundation of knowledge. The result is a widening gap in cultural literacy paralleled with an increasingly socialist mindset.

In recent years, under the guise of "just raising the issue," some educators are saturating school districts with politically-biased materials. Most pervasive are the curricula on nuclear war. One organization, Educators for Social Responsibility, has developed a curriculum resource guide for "dealing with the issues of nuclear war in the classroom." According to Chester E. Finn, information included in the resource guide has little to do with the classroom directly. Rather, Finn explains, it consists of sample letters that teachers can send to parents, school boards and newspaper editors to invite their participation in a "day of dialogue."[7]

What is a "Day of Dialogue?" The *Denver Post* ran an article headlined: "50 Schools Teach Pupils Realities of Nuclear War." According to the article:

> Students at about 50 Denver-area schools Monday found a new subject included in their studies: Nuclear War. Monday's speeches and student discussions about the dangers of nuclear war were part of a nationwide 'Day of Dialogue' organized by a group of teachers and others known as Educators for Social Responsibility.
>
> Sister Mary Gleason, information coordinator for the Denver chapter of the group, said more such programs will be conducted at area schools in the next few weeks.
>
> Most of the programs at area schools seemed to be a distinctly anti-war tone, but Sister Gleason said, "it really isn't meant to be onesided. It is meant to be raising the issue. . . . "[8]

It seems strange that educators should feel it necessary in Denver to raise what is so obviously a military issue. Located at Cheyenne Mountain are the headquarters for the North American Air Defense Command, which is headed up by a four-star Air Force General. Lowery Air Force Base, which among other functions, specializes in military intelligence training, is also in Denver. At Fort Carson there are some 14,000 combat troops stationed under the leadership of a two-star general, and, of course, at Colorado Springs there is the Air Force Academy—to mention just a couple of other military sites in Colorado. Given the presence of those prestigious military installations, one would expect to find among Denver residents—both military and civilian—a sense of pride in the United States and its national defense capabilities. Could their presumed patriotism make those families the real target of Educators for Social Responsibility?

Where the curriculum guidelines of the Educators for Social Responsibility do pertain to the classroom directly, the following is an example of what's included. There is a section entitled "Inflammatory Words Can Teach You To Hate."[9] In this section "teachers and students are encouraged to consult the memoirs of Lt. William Calley to gain a better understanding of how his simplistic grasp of the inflammatory word "communism" led to his actions at Mylai."

Perhaps the most recent and widely publicized example of politically biased materials is NEA's *Choices: A Unit on Conflict and Nuclear War*, curriculum on nuclear war. Gary L. Bauer, Deputy Undersecretary for Planning, Budget and Evaluation has accused the NEA of initiating an "incredibly obvious drive to bring political indoctrination into the classroom."[10] Even the *Washington Post* recognized *Choices* for what it is: "political teaching."[11]

According to military expert Phyllis Schlafly, who heads the National Eagle Forum, "The goals of the nuclear war curricula are (a) to promote U.S. nuclear disarmament (b) to belittle the Soviet threat and (c) to propagandize for federal spending for social goals at the expense of national defense."[12]

One of the most objectionable teaching techniques employed in this curriculum is requiring students to keep a journal. The journal is objectionable because it violates a student's right to privacy. Students are required to write down their thoughts and feelings daily. The curriculum guide tells teachers, "If students hand in journals periodically, you may gain valuable information regarding their reactions to the unit (translated that means, are their attitudes being changed). It is suggested that you collect the journals and that students enter their thoughts and feelings in them daily."[13] By exposing their thoughts, the students are open to intimidation and peer pressure.

In discussing the politicization of American education, a distinction between education and politicization must be drawn. To begin drawing such a distinction, one might look to the intention of the authors of politically biased texts and classroom materials—is it to indoctrinate students? Brainwashing seems even more absurd; however, if one thinks of brainwashing as "breaking down of established patterns of neural activity in a man's brain and building up fresh patterns, so that the man's beliefs become fixed in a new mold"[14] then the intention of such organizations as the Council on Interracial Books for Children just might be as bad as brainwashing.

The Council on Interracial Books for Children, a grantee of the U.S. Department of Education, published their *Guidelines for Selecting Bias-Free Textbooks and Storybooks.* According to David Asman, "The Council's primary objective extended well beyond eliminating racism and sexism."[15] The *Guidelines* state:

> Let's make it clear that we have no desire to see children's books that would solely help the dominated get a bigger piece of the pie. We don't like the pie, period.... We are not interested in seeing different people win a place in the status quo, the present social structure. We are challenging the structure itself because it promotes anti-human values.

One example of the work of the Council on Interracial Books for Children is "Violence, the Ku Klux Klan and the Struggle for Equality."[16] This program was prepared and published by the Connecticut Education Association, the Council on Interracial Books for Children, and the National Education Association.

Excerpts from the text lead teachers and students to believe that American society, not just the KKK, is racist. For example on page 21, one reads: "The Klan has arisen whenever the efforts of oppressed people, particularly black people, to improve their lives threaten the status quo. Thus, it is important to remember that the Klan is only the tip of the iceberg, the most visible and obvious manifestation of the entrenched racism in our society."[17]

According to Robert Bryan, the intent of the textbook writers is not to give the facts, but to give students impressions. Bryan says:

> Besides ignorance, another possible explanation of this extraordinary cavalier treatment of historical fact is that authors

are not especially interested in historical fact *per se*. What they want the textbook to create for the student is not an accurate *account* of the past, but a mere impression which will be consistent with their own beliefs.[18]

A second point to consider in drawing a distinction between education and politicization is to determine whether the materials are "designed to discover, affirm, and teach truth, including wisdom and concrete facts or rather are the materials designed to deceive and therefore promote . . . partial truth, a mixture of facts and non-facts?"[19]

Al Shanker, president of AFT, has criticized the NEA's *Choices* curriculum on this very basis. According to Shanker, "the NEA wants to press one viewpoint."[20] One example cited by Shanker to support his position is the following:

> The lesson plan is loaded with moving accounts by survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, themselves students when the bombs were dropped. A few lines describing why President Truman decided to drop them are inadequate. The stage is set. Then many more pages are given over to the destruction of nuclear war, the effects of a direct hit, the greater power of current weapons, etc. The United States is shown throughout as way ahead of the Soviet Union in nuclear arms—and this is presented as fact, not as an issue now under sharp debate. Moreover, in an effective section designed to surprise students (by first having them guess and then giving them supposedly accurate information), the students are presented with inflated "facts" on the proportion of the U.S. budget to be spent on national defense.[21]

As well as putting students into a more socialist mind set, teaching students with these sorts of politically-biased and inaccurate materials is detrimental to the academic achievement of students. In 1978, the National Assessment of Educational Progress reported that the ability of 17 year-olds to explain democracy's essentials had declined 12 points in 6 years.[22] In 1979, Gallup Poll reported that only 3% of the nation's 17- and 18-year olds could correctly identify Alaska and Hawaii as the last states to join the union.[23] A geography professor at Northern Arizona University found after testing his students that some of them could not find the continents, thought Paris was in Asia, and that the Falkland Islands were a few miles off the coast of England.[24]

Perhaps even more harmful to American education than politically-biased materials are politically biased and motivated teachers. Teachers interact with the students, teachers grade the students, are models for the students and speak with authority to students. When teachers go beyond educating students and begin to indoctrinate students they have gone beyond their limits, and failed in their duty to educate.

Current world affairs courses lend themselves to politicization. Students are particularly vulnerable in these courses when classroom discussions on current events, for example, the U.S. involvement in Central America or the Middle East, do not put the event into historical context or present pro's and con's of the issue equally and fairly. For example, in a Contemporary World Problems class in a high school in Mission Viejo, CA, parents voiced their objections to a teacher who was known to be a critic of the national government in general and the present administration specifically. His bias came through in class very clearly. For example, according to the parents' account, the teacher led a class discussion "on the topic of the U.S.'s mining of Nicaragua's harbor and used the opportunity to expound his own personal beliefs." The parent goes on to say:

> He (the teacher) made the statement that he thought Marxism would be best for Central America; and that the U.S. had no reason to be proud and should be ashamed. He said that President Reagan is the most radical president we've had in decades. He accused anyone who agreed with the President of 'blind nationalism,' . . . According to this parent when their children "attempted to counter remarks made by this teacher, he "made them appear foolish or refused to acknowledge their upraised hand."[25]

Manifestations of this politicization process can be seen outside the classroom as well. One manifestation is the lobbying efforts of the teachers' unions for what are clearly non-education issues. I'm speaking specifically of the NEA, the largest teachers' union in the U.S. NEA's legislative agenda for the 98th Congress sets forth the goals: nuclear disarmament, gun control, ERA, affirmative action, etc.[26] What is ironic is that on what are clearly education issues the NEA falls short. For example, the NEA lobbying efforts were put to work during the public comment period on the proposed regulations for the Hatch Amendment (also known as the Pupil Rights Amendment) which would give parents due process (the procedure for filing a complaint) when and if the Hatch Amendment were violated.[27]

On basic issues of fairness the NEA is also on record as opposing such measures. For example, in May 1984 NEA successfully got a week's delay on the equal access vote in the House (scheduled for May 7, 1984) and then brought 200 lobbyists to Washington to lobby against the bill.[28]

The NEA doesn't stop with setting forth a legislative agenda. The NEA actively trains its teachers to be lobbyists. "Since 1972, NEA professionals have run an estimated 30,000 teachers through political action workshops, in some cases giving them graduate-study credit for taking the program."[29]

According to Gilbert T. Sewall, former education editor of *Newsweek*,

> . . . NEA's emotional support of divisive, essentially non-educational issues such as nuclear disarmament, gun control, abortion rights and affirmative action has been sincere, but disruptive. Not least, it has created an official teacher's outlook at odds with many of the families and communities that teachers serve.[30]

Time and time again, statements are made by NEA national and state leaders that the NEA's goal is to preserve and protect its members' rights rather than fulfill their responsibility to parents and students. For example, the Oregon State affiliate sent a bulletin to its members which said, ". . . the major purpose of our Association is not the education of children, rather it is as ought to be, the extension and/or preservation of our members' rights. We earnestly care about the kids and learning, but it is secondary to the other goals."[31]

Participation in the political process is not wrong—in a democratic society it is expected. However, the leadership of the NEA has adopted a left-wing agenda and has put the organization's resources, body and soul, to the promulgation of political indoctrination.[32] Addressing the United Nations Special Session on Disarmament, Willard McGuire, then NEA president, said:

> ...we must teach our students that positions their governments take are not necessarily the right positions. And that they, like their teachers, have not only a right, but an obligation to protest when their government's action, as in the case of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, threaten our very existence.[33]

The NEA is a strong political force. According to Robert Pear author of "Democrats Court Teachers at Gathering," the NEA, a potent force in Democratic politics, sent more delegates to the party's 1980 convention than any state and hopes to raise $4 million to assist candidates for the presidency and Congress in 1984.[34]

The force of the NEA is real. "State legislators who are otherwise staunch conservatives quake in their boots at the prospect of antagonizing the NEA."[35] For example, a state legislator on a Reagan appointed Advisory Council on Education "was willing to support all aspects of Reagan's education program until NEA was criticized. There, he backed off, mumbling about how the NEA was doing its job as they saw it, and wasn't so bad."[36]

Another manifestation of the presence of politics is the openly active participation of teachers in partisan campaigns. The NEA adopts resolutions at its annual meetings urging all teachers to "devote at least 10 hours" to campaigning for NEA-backed candidates.[37] The NEA-backed candidates are liberal. For example, in 1981-82, Paul Sarbanes (D-MD) was given $10,000, Edward Kennedy (D-MA) was given $9,500, Jeff Bingaman (D-NM) was given $5,000 and Howard Metzenbaum (D-OH) was given $2,500.[38]

A recent but typical example of teacher union members working against a political candidate at the precinct level was reported in the *Washington Post* in an article headlined, "Fairfax Teachers Group Works to Defeat Herrity." The opening paragraph flaunted before the public the ability of the union to turn teachers into campaign workers:

> The Fairfax Education Association has launched an unprecedented effort to knock County Supervisor Chairman John F. Herrity out of office, complete with radio ads, more than 1,000 teachers going door-to-door and 100 teachers working phone banks.[39]

According to the article, the NEA sent out four mailings on behalf of Herrity's opponent, Democrat Patricia Watt, and even paid for several large Watt signs. In spite of the massive campaign waged against him by the NEA, Republican Herrity was victorious on election day. Herrity is a moderately conservative Republican, and Watt is a liberal Democrat.

On the national scene, the NEA was a significant political force in the Pennsylvania primary. According to a report in NEA's own weekly newsletter for NEA leaders, "Mondale won 124 of the state's delegates compared to only 16 for Gary Hart. And NEA members were particularly important in those delegate victories. PSEA members were on the ballot as Mondale delegates in 18 of the state's 23 congressional districts." The report goes on to say, "PSEA provided a major effort in turning out NEA members for the primary. Association activists made over 20,000 phone calls to members, mailed 40,000 letters and distributed 100,000 polling cards."[40]

Reform

Fundamental changes have to be made in the educational system in this country in order to successfully thwart the politicization of American education. Teachers must recognize and accept their professional responsibilities and curriculum must be reformed so that academic integrity is restored.

As discussed, education is the transmittal of knowledge and skills. Students should learn history, english, literature, math and science within the context of Western civilization. Therefore, the public school curriculum should reflect this. Only with a sense of where we have come from and where, as Americans, we are headed will students be able to function as citizens.

In the past year, one has heard a lot about a return to basics. There are basic skills to be learned, namely to read, write and compute. Having mastered these, students must learn the content of a solid core curriculum in the humanities and science. If students learn about world history, literature, government, etc., they will be able then to discuss intelligently and take positions on controversial issues such as the nuclear arms, U.S. involvement in Central America or the Middle East without the "help" of the various classes being taught today under the guise of just raising the issue.

Our purpose in education should be to educate students, thereby liberating them rather than indoctrinating them in liberal ideology so that they become dependent on others for answers and direction.

Not only must a core curriculum be restored, but the textbooks used must be factually accurate and fair in interpretation by the authors. Shared values such as honesty, charity, civility, courage, liberty should come through in the text. The content should be upgraded.

Textbooks publishers have given in to special interest groups. As discussed earlier, the pressure is on to eliminate sexism and racism, to the extent that the Council on Interracial Books seeks to change students attitudes and thought processes rather than teach them history or American Government or literature. Those critical of the American foreign policies clash with those loyal to the U.S. and the result is a textbook inaccurate and slanted in one direction or the other.

Perhaps worst of all, the textbooks are of lower quality, demanding less of the students in order to master the materials presented. Since schools are demanding less, the textbook publishers are simply responding to the demand.

The majority of teachers do rely on textbooks as a tool. In his article "The Politics of Textbooks Adoption," Raymond English stated that approximately 80% of the knowledge to which students are exposed comes from a textbook.[41] Other studies estimate that as much as 95% of classroom time involves the use of textbooks. The influence of textbooks on education demands the attention of school boards, administrators and parents.

The selection and adoption of textbooks is political in itself. Seventeen states have centralized systems of textbook selection. Publishers respond to the selection committees' ideas rather than lose the sale. The textbook review process in each state must be evaluated and changed as needed in order to restore local control of the textbook selection process. Textbook review procedures must include parents and concerned citizens in the community. The forum, for review, and the time frame should allow for honest and open dialogue about the possible texts. Decisions made should reflect community values, goals and ideals.

The teaching profession, itself, must above all reassess its purpose, accept its professional responsibility and respond to the parents in the community in the education of their children.

The teaching profession seems to be in a crisis. The leaders of the largest teachers union in the country are leading the teachers in this country down a dangerous course. Pursuing a left-wing legislative agenda at the expense of educational excellence, the NEA leadership is shirking its responsibilities. Caught up in their "rights" as teachers, these teachers have failed to acknowledge the responsibilities that come with the rights. Consequently, the one-time professional organization has become nothing more than a labor union concerned with getting more; more money, more power, more control. Falling to the way side is any concern about standards within the profession, accountability to the profession itself and the students and parents in the community whom teachers serve. I am talking about accountability in specific terms such as can students read, write, compute, analyze and reason, but also in the much broader picture, namely what have these teachers done for our civilization.

The teaching profession must come to terms with these issues. Teachers must rediscover their profession and embark on a course of reform within the profession. First, public school teachers are state employees unlike doctors and lawyers, nevertheless, teachers must recognize and accept their responsibilities to the profession itself. Looking to the professions of law and medicine for guidance, I suggest that teachers consider the following: state exams for licensing, peer review, and a keen interest in the education of future teachers.

First, state licensing. Since the National Commission on Excellence in Education issued its report last year, there has been an effort to require that teachers pass a basic competency exam before being licensed to teach. This initiative has met with resistance all the way by the National Education Association, yet it is something that doctors and lawyers have had to do for years. It seems even more imperative that public school teachers be required to pass such an exam since parents of public school children have no real choice in the matter of who their children's teachers will be (as opposed to choosing doctors and lawyers). It is in the public interest that teachers be qualified to teach and an exam prior to licensing seems to be the simplest and most efficient way to assess a teacher's ability.

Secondly, peer review. Lawyers have a code of ethics as do doctors. Law students and medical students learn these basic rules in classes like professional responsibility. Once in the profession, lawyers and doctors see to it that their colleagues abide by these rules—the integrity of the profession is at stake. When there is a violation, such as comingling the funds or a conflict of interest, individual attorneys are reprimanded, and, if the violation is grave enough the attorney is disbarred. He/she is no longer able to practice law.

The peer pressure (along with competition) within these professions works to keep the services offered first rate and ethical. Ultimately, the beneficiaries of this peer pressure are the public who seek the advice and counsel of lawyers and doctors. Teachers should follow suit.

Peer review within the teaching profession could work for the public instead of against us. It is not surprising that peer review is an element of many of the reform measures proposed in the last year, for example, merit pay and master teacher plans. It is also not surprising that the National Education Association has been against these reforms. If teachers were held to high standards by one another with the threat of reprimand, the schools would be used much less to propagandize students. Moreover, once again, such propagandizing could be considered an aberration.

Third, teachers should take an interest in the education of future teachers. In law school, more so than medical school, generally students learn the law, with a minimum exposure to the mechanics of applying the law. There are few "methods" courses in law schools. Once the law student has a good understanding of the law, he or she will begin the second phase of learning in a law office as a law clerk. This is often done while the student continues at school. By the time the student graduates and takes the bar exam, he or she is ready to be hired as an associate equipped with a legal education and the skills to apply the education in real life, if you will. During their course of studies, law students are helped along the way by lawyers. Lawyers take an interest in the education of young lawyers. There is a sense of comaraderie.

The education of teachers should take a similar course. The preparation young teachers receive in the classroom should be focused on their selected field of study, be it science, math, the humanities, foreign language, or whatever. A minimum amount of time should be spent on the teacher education courses. Hands-on experience in the classroom would be much more useful.

Toward this end, I think it is important to begin to allow students interested in being teachers to spend some time in college in their chosen field of study. Then have the student educated in his field, learn how to teach the subject through an internship in the classroom. Proposals, such as that in the state of New Jersey, allowing students with a bachelor's degree to teach without having to take umpteen credits of "methods" courses should be seriously considered by each state.[42]

These goals are long term. However, teachers, parents and concerned citizens can begin moving now toward their implementation. For example, teachers who are members of the National Education Association should educate themselves as to what the leadership is doing with the organization and its funds. The NEA is nominally a democratic organization. Teachers must work within the organization to bring it back to its origins—namely, a PROFESSIONAL organization for teachers. Teachers must regain the respect of the parents and the community and consequently their support. Local school boards can require their teachers—including math and science teachers—to take summer courses in the humanities in order to strengthen the foundation from which they are teaching by putting it within the context of Western civilization. Parents and citizens can begin immediately to involve themselves in the selection and evaluation of classroom textbooks and curricula. The responsibility for reform lies with all of us.

In remarks given at the University of Texas at Austin last year, Vice-President George Bush summed up our responsibility in education in clear, eloquent language. He said:

> Education, it has been said, represents the soul of society as it passes from one generation to the next. That thought should make us sober. All that we are—all great devotions, all the crucial writings, and the whole mass of technical knowledge that have produced a civilization in which millions lived in the midst of freedom and abundance—all these stand perched at the edge of an abyss each time one generation attempts to educate the next.
>
> If we stumble once, we are lost. If we fail to instruct our children in reason, justice, religion and liberty, they will not know these virtues but will live instead in the twilight of a

world in which the great truths have been forgotten. Knowledge represents a trust handed down to us by the generations. To pass that trust on intact—to educate—represents no mere task, but a high duty."

April 7, 1983

Notes

1. Chester E. Finn, *Commentary*, February 1983.
2. Edwin J. DeLattre, "No Empty Heads, No Hallow Chests," *American Educator*, Vol. 5, No. 2, Summer 1981, p. 20.
3. Allan Brownfeld, *Washington Times*, January 31, 1983.
4. NEA Convention, 1982.
5. *Classroom Treatment of The Right to Work*, CEAFU, Fairfax, Va., May 1979.
6. Robert Bryan, *History, Pseudo-History, Anti-History: How Public School Textbooks Treat Religion*, (Washington, D. C., Learn, Inc., 1984).
7. Chester E. Finn, "Teacher Politics," *Commentary*, February 1983, p. 39.
8. *Denver Post*, October 26, 1982.
9. Chester E. Finn, op. cit., p. 39.
10. *Human Events*, "Education Official Hits NEA Nuke Course," June 18, 1983.
11. "Political Teaching," *The Washington Post*, April 5, 1983.
12. "Pacifist Propaganda for Pupils," *Washington Inquirer*, August 5, 1983.
13. *Choices: A Unit on Conflict and Nuclear War*, (National Education Association, Washington, D. C., 1983), p. 13.
14. J. P. White, "Indoctrination," in R. S. Peters, ed., *The Concept of Education* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967), p. 187.
15. "Spotlighting Federal Grants: The Council on Interracial Books for Children." *Backgrounder*, The Heritage Foundation, 214 Massachusetts Ave., Washington, D.C. 20002, (June 10, 1982), p. 2.
16. *Violence, The Ku Klux Klan and the Struggle for Equality*, The Connecticut Education Association, The Council on Interracial Books for Children and the NEA, 1981.
17. Ibid, p. 21.
18. Robert Byran, *History, Pseudo-History, Anti-History*, p. 9.
19. Ernest N. Lefever, E. Stephen Hunt, "Education, Propaganda and Nuclear Arms," *Phi Delta Kappan*, June 1983, p. 727.
20. "Where We Stand," Al Shanker, *New York Times*, April 17, 1983.
21. Ibid.
22. 1978 National Assessment of Educational Progress.
23. Gallup Poll, 1979.
24. *Tucson Citizen*, March 3, 1983.

25. Parent, Mission Viejo, CA, May 1984 (Correspondence to Molly Moore, U.S. Department of Education).
26. "The NEA Legislative Program for the 98th Congress," *Today's Education*, 1983, p. 114.
27. Basically, the Hatch Amendment requires that parents give their permission before their children submit to any psychological examination, testing or treatment. (P.L. 95-561, The Education Amendments of 1978).
28. The Equal Access bill would give religious groups the same access to school facilities as other student groups. (Congressman Bonker D-WA. 98th Congress. Equal Access H.R. 5345).
29. Eugene H. Methvin, "The NEA: A Washington Lobby Run Rampant," *Reader's Digest*, November 1978.
30. *Wall Street Journal*, January 6, 1983.
31. *The American School Board Journal*, January 1982.
32. It must be noted that on many issues the NEA leadership does not adequately represent its memberships interest. For example, in Harrisburg, PA, the NEA leaders acted on their own in joining a coalition against nuclear energy. This action was taken "... not only without the sanction of the Representative Assembly, but over the objection of the Pennsylvania State affiliate." Robert Kagan, "A Relic of the New Age: The National Education Association" *The American Spectator*, February 1982.
33. Chester E. Finn, "Teacher Politics," *Commentary*, February 1983.
34. *New York Times*, July 3, 1983.
35. *Crisis in Education Parent Power vs. the Establishment*, p. 11.
36. Ibid.
37. *Today's Education*, 1983-84. Resolution G-1.
38. NEA-PAC, 1981-82.
39. *Washington Post*, November 2, 1983.
40. "Political Action," *NEA Now*, April 16, 1984.
41. Raymond English, "The Politics of Textbook Adoption," *Phi Delta Kappan*, December 1980, p. 275.
42. *The Nation Responds*, U.S. Department of Education (Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984), p. 93.

SIX

Citizenship Education: Recovering a Lost Dimension

Linda Chavez

Recent opinion polls show that the more education a person has, the less likely he or she is to be proud to be an American.[1] What causes this inverse relationship between years of formal schooling and love of country? Clearly, a change has taken place over the last ten years in the way in which our schools teach civics and that change may have contributed to this inversion. At best, what children learn in school today about their country and its political system may leave them confused and lacking conviction. Doubt seems to have replaced patriotism as a virtue to be inculcated.

Much of the change that has taken place in citizenship education has spilled over from the values education movement of the last decade and a half. Neutrality—whether it be about right and wrong or democracy and tyranny—is the dominant theme. Textbooks illustrate this change more acutely than nearly any other source, in part because textbook publishers must respond to market pressures more than must any other segment of the education community. Textbooks rarely precipitate trends in education, but they fairly accurately chronicle them.

In one of the most frequently used high school texts, *American Political Behavior*, authors Howard Mehlinger and John Patrick promise "As a safeguard against biased presentation of information and propaganda, students of political behavior must learn skills of critical thinking and social scientific inquiry. . . . Thus, we have tried to design lessons aimed at tracking the skills of using evidence and logic to substantiate factual claims and to consider value claims rationally."[2] What follows in Messrs. Mehlinger and Patrick's book aims at neutrality but delivers confusion. In one chapter, students learn that countries have different political cultures just as they have different languages and customs. "The concepts of democracy and autocracy provide one way to look at, or interpret, differences in political culture and behavior," say the authors, who then go on to describe some of the differences between the two systems. But while the authors seem sure of the relative demerits of autocracy—"Ideas are not freely debated. . . . Individuals who dissent from the 'party line' may go to prison or be killed."—they seem much more cautious about the merits of democracy. Each word used to describe the democratic system is qualified: "In the United States *most people think* that democracy is good. . . ." [Emphasis added] "Below are some political beliefs that *most people would call* democratic." [Emphasis added] "When trying to decide whether a political culture or government is democratic, remember that among the nations of the world there are *no perfect democracies*. Political cultures or governments are *more or less democratic* in terms of the standards of majority rule and protection of individual rights." [Emphasis added][3] Why the timidity in proclaiming the superiority of our system of government or even its claim to the democratic ideal?

The Mehlinger and Patrick book is hardly unique. Jeane Kirkpatrick noted several years ago in a monograph entitled *Values in An American Textbook*, that another popular textbook, *American Government in Action* by Miriam Rober Resnik and Lillian Herlick Nerenberg,[4] fails "to communicate the basic values of the Western tradition."

Among Kirkpatrick's criticisms of the book is that it concentrates too heavily on administrative arrangements in government to the detriment of the fundamental principles that undergird the political system. "When government is reduced to a set of administrative arrangements designed for the mutual convenience of those residing within specified boundaries," she says, "it becomes impossible to understand the importance of politics to human history. When government is reduced to a commercial relationship and citizens to customers, the effect is still worse. Not only is government trivialized, but citizenship is deprived of moral and social meaning."[5]

It is precisely this moral and social meaning that can engender loyalty. Rabbi Hillel framed the fundamental question for those who ask why it is important to be loyal: "If I am not for myself, who is for me? But if I am only for myself, what am I?" Loyalty is at the very core of human values; without it, no social bond exists between men.

Loyalty requires that we recognize a relationship to our fellow man. It is incompatible with selfishness or self-centeredness; it relegates the "me" to second place. Perhaps for this reason, loyalty is more difficult to teach today than it has ever been. We are used to being told, and telling others, "You're number one," "You've got to think of yourself," "You decide what's best for you and then do it" that we have forgotten that each of us is a part of something greater than ourselves—a family, a community, a nation—to which we owe our loyalty.

Adolescents absorbed in the quest for discovery of self present perhaps the greatest challenge in teaching about loyalty. Teenagers are more concerned with freedom than they are with loyalty; freedom appeals to their sense of individuality and their desire for liberty—or more accurately, liberation from the constraints of parents, school, and adult authority in general. But if adolescents can be taught to feel that they are part of community, not just individuals pursuing their own gains, the seeds of loyalty can be sown.

Vincent Reed, former superintendent of schools of the

District of Columbia, describes what can take place when students tie their own self-esteem to their pride in the community school. The following exchange occurred when a Department of Education official accompanied Reed on a visit to the District's Woodson High School:

"This Department of Education official and I went in to talk to the students in a math class at the school, and the first thing he said was that he had been to high schools all over the country and this was the first one he'd been in where there was no grafitti on the walls. And he asked the students if they could tell him why it was that their school was so clean. A girl raised up her hand, and she was hostile. 'Did you come here expecting to see grafitti?' she asked. 'And if so, why?' Of course, she was hinting that he expected that because the kids were black. Well, the fellow was so flustered that he mumbled through something and when we got out in the hall, he said, 'Well, I'll never make that mistake again.' The point is, the kids were proud that their school was so clean." Loyalty to the school in this instance meant keeping the school grafitti-free.

From his own youthful experience Reed recalls, "We used to get a grade in citizenship. That was always the first grade my parents looked at.

"Youngsters aren't born with the knowledge of what a good citizen is," says Reed. "You've got to talk about it and give them examples of good citizenship. Teachers and others in the school should practice good citizenship, too. I think we have to go back to being concerned about citizenship. It affects behavior and improves grades."[6]

The relationship between what children learn from textbooks and formal teaching and what they observe in the character of the school is an important one. Textbooks will change only if greater emphasis is placed on patriotism by parents and teachers. Until that time, what can parents and teachers do to try to instill the civic virtues in children?

A revival of the old formulae of patriotic songs and poems, of the recitation of the pledge of allegiance to the flag, of celebration of national holidays and national heroes that were the universal staple of American classrooms only a few years ago is still perhaps the best way of introducing young children to patriotism. Older children will require more depth in their training, however.

One of the most useful approaches in dealing with children at this age may be to try to develop a more sophisticated understanding of the obligations that freedom entails. Rousseau described the change that took place when man went from living in a state of nature, where he lived unfettered by law or custom, to living in society, where he "exchanged natural independence for freedom, the power to destroy others for the enjoyment of (his) own security. . . ."[7] But such an exchange was not without its obligations. Rousseau's words may serve as a partial response to those who question why they should, under any circumstances, be called on to defend their country: "Their very lives, which they have pledged to the state, are always protected by it; and even when they risk their lives to defend the state, what more are they doing by giving back what they have received from the state. . . . Assuredly, all must now fight in case of need for their country, but at least no one has any longer to fight for himself. And is there not something to be gained by running, for the sake of the guarantee of safety, a few of those risks we should each have to face alone if we were deprived of that assurance?"[8]

Loyalty to country may inspire acts of courage, but students need to learn that patriotism can be exemplified in private observance of the law as well as in public displays of heroism. Socrates' refusal to disobey the laws of Athens, even when his refusal meant that he would face death, is recounted by his most famous pupil, Plato, in the dialogue "Crito."

Socrates gives eloquent expression to the need to obey the laws of the nation as much when they are inconvenient as when they are convenient. Obedience to the law, however, is not blind obedience. It requires moral judgment and adherence to the principles of right and wrong.

> Are you so wise that you failed to see that something else is more precious than father and mother and all your ancestors besides—your country, something more reverend, more holy,

> of greater value, as the gods judge, and any men that have sense? You must honour and obey and conciliate your country when angry, more than a father; you must either persuade her, or do whatever she commands; you must bear in quiet anything she bids you bear, be it stripes or prison; of if she leads you to war, to be wounded or to die, this you must do, and it is right; you must not give way or retreat or leave your post, but in war and in court and everywhere you must do whatever city and country commands, or else convince her where the right lies. Violence is not allowed against mother or father, much less against your country.[9]

The failure to instill a sense of loyalty to one's country and the obligations that entail can have devastating consequences. The United States has one of the lowest voter participation rates of any free society and the long-term consequences of voter apathy may bode badly for the future of our democracy. The failure of so many young men to register for the draft may portend dire consequences for our ability to defend democracy from outside threats as well; at no time in history including at the height of the anti-war movement of the 1960s was failure to comply with the law as high as it is now.[10] Perhaps the greatest threat, however, comes from disaffection and alienation that this lack of commitment breeds in certain individuals. The story of Christopher Boyce, who sold United States surveillance secrets to the USSR, is a chilling example.

CBS correspondent Ed Bradley interviewed Boyce and others for the television show "60 Minutes."[11] In vivid detail the following excerpts illustrate the nadir of disloyalty to which some persons can sink:

> *Bradley:* Last week, British spy Geoffrey Prime went to jail for giving away the most sensitive British and American secrets. Five years ago, so did this man, Christopher Boyce.
>
> What he had given away to the Soviets—or, more accurately, sold to the Soviets—was the secret that our satellite surveillance system was telling us just about everything the Russians were up to. Having learned that we were listening in, the Soviets started putting out false information. What that did was to make our intelligence-gathering satellites virtually useless.
>
> Boyce is now serving forty years for espionage at Marion

Federal Penitentiary. Recently, we talked with him about why he and his partner, Dalton Lee, did it.

You willingly turned that information over to the Russians?

Christopher Boyce: You bet.

Bradley: In the courts of this land, you've been tried and convicted of espionage.

Boyce: Right.

Bradley: You are a traitor.

Boyce: Mm-hmm.

Bradley: Does that bother you?

Boyce: Well, if you qualify it as a traitor to what. I think that you can't protect any freedoms or liberties behind stockpiles of nuclear weapons and chemical and biological weapons, and I think that the United States government is eventually going to involve the United States and the rest of the world in a nuclear war; and I don't mind being called a traitor to the United States government at all, no. I think the United States government needs a few more traitors. Humanity needs a few more.

Bradley: Sen. Daniel Moynihan, the vice chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, believes that what Boyce and Lee turned over to the Russians had a major impact on the SALT talks. Senator, how would you describe to the average American just what happened as a result of Boyce and Lee?

Sen. Daniel P. Moynihan: Well, basically, with respect to the satellite systems that were compromised, they made them, temporarily, at least, useless to us because the Soviets could block them. And the fear that that would happen, had happened, permeated the Senate and, as much as any one thing, was responsible for the failure of the SALT treaty; and, if you think, as I do, that the breakdown of our arms negotiations with the Soviets is an ominous event, then nothing quite so awful has happened to our country as the escapade of these two young men.

Bradley: All of that information was accurate material? (Moynihan nodding)

Bradley: It's difficult to understand why Boyce held such a grudge against his country. He had so much of what this nation can bestow on its young men. He grew up here in Palos Verdes, one of the wealthiest communities in this country. He was the oldest of nine children in a very closely knit family. His father had left a career with the FBI for a job in private industry that paid a lot more money. Boyce was said to be sensitive, intelligent and a devout Catholic. . . .

With the help of his father, twenty-one-year-old Chris Boyce, a drop-out from three colleges, with no real work experience, was able to land a job here at TRW as a security clerk. The pay was only $140 a week, and it would seem to be an insignificant job; but within just a few months, it would lead Boyce to another job, this one in the "black vault"—or code room—a facility so sensitive, so top secret, that only eight other people with the highest government security clearances had regular access. Now, on the surface, the "black vault" would seem to be completely secure. To get in, you had to go past an array of guards, television monitors and check points; but how did Chris Boyce find that security?

Boyce: I guess there was no security, like the codes are supposed to be destroyed each day, but we used to just throw 'em in the corner, and there was a large blender to put the codes in, and you would blend them down to mush. Well, we—they—never used that to destroy codes with. We made daiquiris in it.

Bradley: A few months after getting the job, Boyce started selling the highly classified material to the Russians. His partner in the crime: his old friend, Dalton Lee, used the money paid by the Soviets to finance his illegal drug business. Boyce would photograph the secret material with his small Minox-B camera, give it to Dalton, and Dalton Lee would hand it to the Soviet KGB agents in Mexico City.

Bradley: If you had the chance to do it all over again, you'd do the same thing that would put you right back here?

Boyce: Only better.

There is no way of knowing whether or not Christopher Boyce's defection from the moral community could have been prevented by better training as a child. Indeed, the details of his childhood—devotion to his church for example—would lead one to assume that he had loyalties to the major institutions in his young life. However, it is clear that his sense of early loyalty to one institution did not generalize into what Philosopher Andrew Oldenquist has called "loyalty patriotism."[12] Oldenquist illustrates the idea of loyalty patriotism with the following example:

> Suppose that we witness the following scene. A family is vacationing at the beach; as the father walks up on the pier he sees his daughter and her acquaintance fall out of their canoe, swim for a minute in different directions, and then both begin

> to drown. Being sure he can save only one, he lets his daughter drown and saves the other girl. Asked why, he says either (a) he was ever so slightly surer of being able to reach the acquaintance in time, or (b) the acquaintance was well on her way to being a brilliant scientist, bound to contribute more to the general happiness than his daughter, and, given that he could not save both, the choice he made produced more positive value. What do we think of this father? Would we want to shake his hand, or tell the story in the local paper as a moral lesson? Is he not a great fool, an object of pity and contempt? Indeed, this is the kind of incident we are embarrassed even to talk about, unlike cases of moral heroism or gross selfishness.[13]

In fact, says Oldenquist, "The contempt we feel toward traitors is not unlike what we feel toward the father who lets his daughter drown."[14]

Teaching students about loyalty may begin with making them aware of the duties and obligations they have toward others. Loyalty of family members to each other includes love and respect, along with duty and obligation. The story of Penelope's fidelity to Odysseus throughout his twenty-year absence is a quiet tale of perseverance of the loyalty between husband and wife. A more dramatic story of family loyalty, recounted by E. W. Cassels in a boy scout book, tells of the young soldier who risks his life to bring to safety his wounded brother, only to have the boy die when they reach their own lines.[15] Family loyalty can involve sacrifice and courage, or it can be as simple as the tale of Ruth and Naomi, in which the widowed Ruth pledges her steadfastness to her mother-in-law, Naomi, with the affirmation, "Thy people shall be my people, and thy God, my God."

Children are first and foremost members of their families; but as they grow older, they form new associations and their allegiances expand. Youngsters can learn about loyalty as members of a sports team or as boy or girl scouts; they can learn about loyalty in school assemblies, at pep rallies, or on the debating team. Helping children to form allegiances will better prepare them to become loyal citizens and to understand the duties and responsibilities that citizenship requires.

Teaching about loyalty should be one of the fundamentals of education. Without a sense that they are members of a community, students will be ill-equipped to accept the obligations that school and society impose. Will Durant in *The Story of Civilization* recalls that Charles Darwin chose conscience as the most impressive distinction between animals and men. "In its higher development, conscience is social consciousness—the feeling of the individual that he belongs to a group, and owes it some measure of loyalty and consideration. Morality is the cooperation of the part with the whole, and of each group with some larger whole. Civilization would be impossible without it."[16] Teachers who shirk their responsibility to teach loyalty and students who fail to learn its lessons will find no easy answer to Rabbi Hillel's question.

Notes

1. Everett Carll Ladd, Jr. "What the Polls Tell Us," *The Wilson Quarterly*, Spring 1979.
2. Howard D. Mehlinger and John J. Patrick, *American Political Behavior* (Lexington, Mass.: Ginn & Company, 1980), pp. 102-104.
3. Ibid.
4. Jeane Kirkpatrick, *Values in an American Government Textbook*, (Washington, DC: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1978), p. 17.
5. Ibid., p. 20.
6. Interview with Vincent Reed, 1981.
7. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Social Contract*. (Darby, Pa.: Darby Books, 1980).
8. Ibid.
9. Plato, "Crito," *Great Dialogues of Plato*, translated by W. H. D. Rouse and edited by Philip G. Rouse and Eric H. Warmington, (New York: New American Library, 1956).
10. According to the *New York Times*, at the height of the Vietnam era, compliance with the draft never fell below 98%. Currently, draft registration is at about 94%. *New York Times*, July 20, 1982, p. D21.
11. "60 Minutes" Volume XII, #10, November 21, 1982.
12. Andrew Oldenquist, "Loyalties," *The Journal of Philosophy* LXXIX, #4, April 1982.
13. Ibid., p. 186.
14. Ibid., p. 187.
15. E. W. Cassels, *The Scout Law in Action*, compiled by Walter MacPeek (Nashville: Abington Press, 1966).
16. Will and Ariel Durant, *The Story of Civilization*, Vol. 1, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1967).

SEVEN

Looking at Some Research on What Makes an Effective School

Thomas R. Ascik

In the 1982 case of *Pauley v. Bailey*, a state court in West Virginia effectively abolished the public school system of that state by declaring that the system of financing it unconstitutionally discriminated against poorer school districts. The court required that a master plan be developed that would completely redesign every aspect of the school system. According to the state superintendent of schools, the master plan has relied on "current research to define an effective school, an effective principal, and an effective teacher."[1] In 1979, New York City and Milwaukee were among the first of our major cities to initiate large school-improvement projects based on the line of education studies known as "effective schools research." A recent study by the Education Commission of the States[2] reported that a majority of the states are preparing or already carrying out school-reform projects that have been largely inspired by research on effective schools.

Clearly, these are influential times for education research. But, while "effective-schools research" is widely known in the twin worlds of education research and education practice, few parents, whose children are already or soon will be directly affected by changes based upon it, have even heard of these studies. It is the purpose of this chapter to review some of the work in effective-schools research.

Some preliminaries are necessary. Historically, there has been a gap in academic achievement between children coming from largely white middle- and upper-income families and children from low-income families, a great disproportion of which are black. This fact is perennially one of the major issues in American education. Numerous government programs, e.g. Chapter 1, Compensatory Education Headstart, have been created to counteract it. The findings of the famous 1966 Coleman Report, namely, that its causes were more related to family background than to the effects of schooling, cast a pall over educators who thought that schools could overcome the adverse academic effects of family environments where there was no tradition of learning. Effective schools research has been an attempt to lift that pall. It has been based upon the hypothesis that if schools could be found where achievement of low-SES[3] children was higher than could be expected, then it would be worthwhile observing, examining, and describing the important characteristics of such schools.

Research and writing about effective schools has been criticized for being concerned too much with second-hand interpretation and not enough with original research.[4] This chapter is confined to review of original research, and the only works examined are those based on the "case-study" method—that is, based on detailed descriptions of schools. Excluded is research in which the author emphasizes conclusions and interpretations based on what he saw but shortchanges the reader on the observations themselves. All the authors included here do have their own interpretations, but those interpretations are not considered below. Not all effective schools research emphasizing the case-study method could be considered because of limitations of space. Additionally, the last two works included here, both by journalists, are not normally regarded as formal research by the research community. They are included because they are detailed case studies and because, it was thought, the technique of keen observation is as highly developed in the craft of journalism as it is in social science.

Inner-City Children Can Be Taught to Read

In 1971, George Weber, Associate Director of the Council for Basic Education, launched the line of study now known as effective schools research with the publication of his study *Inner City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools.*[5]

Weber's work consisted of case studies of four inner-city schools which met his three criteria: 1) a non-selective public school in the central part of a large city attended by very poor children; 2) third-grade reading achievement at a national grade norm score as a median; and 3) a low percentage of gross reading failures.

P.S. 11 in Manhattan enrolled a student body of 750 children (a recent decline from 1200) in pre-kindergarten through fifth grade of whom 50 percent were Puerto Rican and 17 percent black, and of whom 80 percent qualified for free lunch. The school had been selected to participate in a special school-improvement program, More Effective Schools, five years previously. Smaller classes, heterogeneous grouping (as opposed to homogeneous grouping or "ability-tracking"), supplementary teachers specializing in reading, extra supervisory and auxiliary personnel (e.g. three assistant principals), and pre-kindergarten classes were the main features of the More Effective Schools program. Weber identified the principal, who was involved in every detail of the operation and organization of the school, as the source of the obvious order and purpose about the school. Additionally, without any single reading program being prescribed, there was a school-wide emphasis on early reading achievement, phonics instruction, homework, and individualized diagnostic testing and instruction.

Finally, individualized instruction was only one aspect of school-wide high expectations and concern for every pupil.

The John Finley Elementary School, also in Manhattan, enrolled 980 students in kindergarten through sixth grade, almost all of whom qualified for free lunch and of whom 70 percent were black and 30 percent Spanish-speaking. Weber's own summary paragraph describing the school's success can serve us here: "Five features of the reading program stand out: all of the pupils are started in the same way in heterogeneous classes in the first half of first grade; individualization and grouping on the basis of reading progress begins in the second half of the first grade; careful and frequent evaluation is done by someone outside the classroom; a very large quantity and variety of materials is used; and phonics, both implicit and explicit, is taught in the first two grades. This planned, precise reading program benefits from a general school atmosphere that includes high expectations, a concern for every child, and considerable home involvement through homework and home-school communications."[6] It should be added that in his complete description of the school Weber attributes the good school atmosphere largely to the order, confidence, and optimism provided by the principal of eleven years' tenure.

The Woodland School, a nearly 100 percent black school in Kansas City, enrolled 650 students (from a recent high of 1200) in kindergarten through seventh grade almost all of whom came from very poor families. The most important reason for the success of Woodland School seemed to be its participation in Project Uplift, a program initiated by the dynamic, reform-minded school superintendent, Robert Wheeler, who came to his job determined to improve reading achievement by emphasizing beginning reading skills. This program included reading and speech specialists in each school, teacher aides, re-training of teachers ("because staff expectations about pupil potential had to be raised"),[7] and the Sullivan Programmed Reading Series, published by McGraw-Hill, a highly structured, highly disciplined course of individualized self-paced instruction designed so that a student advanced only after mastering his current material. Classes at Woodland were relatively large, and, within grades, classes were roughly grouped by reading achievement. According to Weber, the school's success could be attributed to the emphasis on reading, high expectations for the students, and the use of the Sullivan materials; although, with regard to those materials, Weber insisted they "can be understood only in terms of the spirit and objectives"[8] of the larger Project Uplift. Interestingly, Weber thought that special, compensatory education classes were, on balance, "a negative factor."

At the Ann Street School in the center of Los Angeles, there were 406 very low-income students in kindergarten through sixth grade of whom 62 percent were Mexican-American and 38 percent were black. There were two reasons for the success of the school. The first was a schoolwide emphasis on reading as carried out by the Sullivan Reading Series, already described; some attention to phonics; and "the excellent and imaginative work of the reading specialist."[9] The second was the leadership of the principal whose arrival at the school four years previously had marked the starting point of the school's improvement. She accomplished the improvement in two stages. As Weber puts it, "Her first problem, as she saw it, was to establish order in the building and to create a level of discipline that would facilitate learning. Having accomplished that, she turned to the curriculum."[10]

Overall, the liability of Weber's work is that, except for a rather peculiar table aggregating the reading scores of all four schools together, he provides no proof (i.e. data) of the successful reading achievement of the four schools but, instead, expects the reader to take his word for it.

Schools Can Make A Difference

In 1979, sociologist Wilbur Brookover (*et al.*) published his work on effective schools, *School Social Systems and Student Achievement*,[11] a substantial part of which contained descriptions of case studies of four low-SES schools. Because Brookover was primarily interested in observing and describing "school climate," the case study method of research was a necessity, for "the way in which a given climate is developed and the way in which students, teachers, and principals become socialized in it are questions which cannot be answered through . . . statistical analysis."[12] Brookover chose four low-SES schools, two all-black and two all-white, all in Michigan. At two of the schools, the average achievement scores were higher than the scores normally associated with such schools. The other two schools had more predictable scores. Instead of identifying the schools, he simply listed them as White A, Black A, White B, Black B.

White A was a comparatively high-achieving school located in an all-white, stable suburban community largely homogeneous in social background and class. With all of its students living nearby and many walking to school, and with active community use of the school building for nonschool activities, it seemed a throwback to the classic notion of the neighborhood school. To account for the success of the school, Brookover zeroed in on the principal, various behaviors of the teachers, and certain academic practices. The principal emphasized his role as instructional leader and made unannounced visits to each teacher's classroom at least thirty times a year. With regard to the teachers, the time spent in the classroom was well-organized so as to maximize instruction and to minimize noninstructional activities. The teachers exhibited high expectations for the students, did not "write off" any student as unable to learn, constantly reinforced the morale of the students, and used competitive team games as teaching tactics. At White A, ability-grouping (tracking) was confined to within-classroom grouping only in the subject of reading and only in the first three grades. To Brookover and his team, the most important element in the success of the school was the willingness of the teachers and principal to accept personal responsibility for student achievement.

The students at Black A, another school where achievement was higher than could be predicted for low-SES children, came from a predominantly black community located on the fringe of a large metropolitan area. Brookover's first and continuing impression of the school was of discipline and order. For instance, he was struck by the principal's admonition to the teachers at a faculty meeting about the importance of establishing a climate of discipline from the moment the students entered the building. All the faculty and staff cooperated at all times, both in the classroom and without, in maintaining the climate of discipline and order. In fact, Brookover was somewhat surprised to discover that student behavior and discipline, not student achievement, was the most prevalent topic of conversation among the faculty. As in White A, there was a great deal of engagement—and few noninstructional activities—during classroom time. Achievement grouping existed at Black A, and each classroom was divided into three such groups.

Brookover found that the teachers rarely gave up completely on any student even when they realized that out-of-school factors were severely hampering learning. Instead, the overall climate of the school was one of high expectations for all students. Morale of the teachers was high because of the mutual, committed support they gave to each other and because parents were supportive. The principal at Black A was rated very high as an administrator, but his view was that teachers are primarily responsible for the quality of education in a school. By contrast, the previous principal of four years was very much an instructional leader, and much of the faculty felt that the relatively high achievement of the school was the result of his efforts.

White B was an all-white, low-SES school where students were low-achievers, that is to say, their achievement scores were at the level predicted by their SES. As such, White B was in sharp contrast to White A where the achievement scores were high despite the low social status. From his observations of the school, Brookover arrived at five conclusions to account for the low scores. First, there was a great disparity among different classrooms in the amount of time spent on instruction. The good teachers seemed to spend 80 percent of class time on instruction, but the worst teachers only 10 percent, according to Brookover's reckoning. Disorder in the classroom was not always the cause of wasted time, for Brookover's research team observed one fourth grade teacher who kept good order during class but who had students doing "seatwork" predominantly, with little direct instruction or assistance coming from the teacher. Second, teachers did mentally "write off" some of the slow learners who, as a consequence, seemed left out of instructional activities. Third, there was an almost unanimous belief among the teachers that the possibility of academic achievement is controlled by a student's background. To these teachers the low achievement scores of the school were understandable. Fourth, Brookover thought that ability-grouping practices were too rigid because of little upward movement out of the low group. Fifth, the principal seemed aloof from both students and teachers and did not emphasize his role as instructional leader.

The situation was much the same at Black B, a low-SES and low-achieving school with a predominantly black student body. Teachers either failed to keep order in the classrooms or merely kept students "busy" rather than engaged in instructional activities. Again, "writing off" students was prevalent with a significant percentage of the faculty attributing low-achievement to poor family background. Brookover observed that teacher efforts to build students' morale were often counter-productive, with excessive praise given to substandard work rather than constant encouragement to bring work up to standard. Ability grouping might have been too elaborate at Black B with constant disruptions in classrooms caused by students moving between rooms in order to be with different groupings at different times. Finally, the principal seemed to be a capable administrator, had a good rapport with teachers, was firmly committed to discipline, and considered academics her top priority. Yet, Brookover faulted her for believing too much in family background as the determinant of school achievement and for not giving enough of a sense of urgency and direction in academics.

Why Do Some Schools Succeed?

Phi Delta Kappa, the national education fraternity, publisher of *Phi Delta Kappan* magazine and numerous other publications in education, conducted a study of "effective schools" that led to its 1980 book *Why Do Some Urban Schools Succeed?*[13] The volume included case studies conducted by various research teams of eight exceptional urban elementary schools.

At Washington Park Elementary School (grades K-6) in Cincinnati, Ohio, 92 percent of the students were from low-income families, and 70 percent were black. The research team selected Washington Park because of steady gains in reading and mathematics achievement over a four-year period.

According to the team studying Washington Park, by far the most important element of the school was its remarkable, indefatigable, enthusiastic principal, Roger Haynes. Here was the prototype of the "effective principal." He established a climate of fair and expeditious discipline and took every opportunity daily, in the halls, at the entrances and exits, in the cafeteria, at school assemblies, to reinforce the rules and climate of the school. Interestingly, Haynes avoided a legalistic codification of specific rules but, instead, based discipline on his own personal authority and stature and constantly reinforced discipline by in-person teaching and exhortations. As part of discipline—or, more accurately, as the "soul" of discipline—the principal emphasized manners and spent a good deal of time teaching good manners. A master at using time effectively, Haynes thought that the "principal's use of time separates the exceptional school from the unexceptional school."[14] This skill at organizing time enabled him to give teachers and students a sense of his omnipresence in the building while he still performed all his administrative and public relations functions. Haynes accomplished one of his major purposes, freeing teachers to teach, by assigning monitoring of halls, the school grounds, and the cafeteria to himself and his assistant principal. Finally, the principal spent very little time on direct observation or evaluation of teaching but concentrated his efforts in that area on screening and interviewing teachers for vacancies. Otherwise, teachers were left to their own devices in the classrooms.

Washington Park's principal did not exhibit a specific overall instructional philosophy—or at least the research did not comment on it. The school was benefitting from a system-wide emphasis on reading, mathematics, and homework, which the principal and teaching staff wholeheartedly endorsed. But at Washington Park the researchers attributed the success of the system's emphases to the principal's determined enthusiasm and the high expectations put on the students by an equally enthusiastic teaching staff.

In Chicago, the Leif Ericson Elementary School had a student body of 885 children in grades K-8 of whom 99 percent were black and 66 percent came from low-income families. Located in the poorest district in Chicago, the school gained a reputation for tight organization and supervision over a five-year period starting with the advent of a new principal, Marjorie Branch. Although the school had not reached the point where all children were reading at grade level, progress in reading was occurring.

The researchers identified approximately seven reasons for Branch's success: 1) she actively supervised the teachers and invested time and effort in staff development; 2) she was highly visible during the school day; 3) she established strict standards concerning tardiness and the wearing of appropriate dress; 4) she demanded lesson plans from teachers and evaluated both the plans and the teachers themselves closely; 5) she made teachers responsible for student achievement; 6) she closed the school campus to outside visitors and required students to stay on campus throughout the school day. Finally, she instituted a Continuous Progress/Mastery Learning Structure for the curriculum whereby learning objectives were specified and student mastery of each objective had to be achieved before the student proceeded to the next objective.

The other overarching element that contributed to the success of the school was the family-type atmosphere of intimacy fostered by the principal and staff as symbolized by their informal motto: "We are Parents too." With so many of the children coming from circumstances of poverty that were presumably coupled with the predictable social and family problems associated with poverty, the adults at the school set about to provide a serious, stabilizing influence for the students.

In Gary, Indiana, a research team visited Banneker Individualized Curriculum Center, a public elementary school where reading and math scores went from the lowest in the city to the highest. The percentage of the student body that come from indigent families declined from 50 percent to 18 percent over a period of five years, a significant fact that may account for the improvement in test scores although the researchers present somewhat persuasive analyses of why they think it did not.

The academic success of Banneker could be divided into two periods, the first of which was a radical decision by the school system to contract for the operation of Banneker with a private corporation that would guarantee month-to-month progress in reading and math. The contract lasted only three years and was beset by various kinds of difficulties, caused primarily by the teachers' union, from the beginning. Such problems were symptomatic of the main liability of the terms of the contract, namely, that the company contracting to operate the school did not have complete control over the school and its staff. Nevertheless, all concerned agreed that the three-year experience had permanent good effects on the school because it taught the administration and teaching staff how to develop, implement, and maintain an instructional system based on the strict commitment of the school to being held accountable for academic performance of the children.

Replacing the company contract was Competencies I, an individualized, comprehensive curriculum designed to make instruction systematic, the staff accountable, and featuring ceaseless checking and rechecking of student progress. Its obvious similarities to the educational goals of the contract—which also was an individualized curriculum—provided a continuity of themes for Banneker. Overall it seemed to the research team that three elements made Banneker an exceptional school. First, the team decided that the school's exceptionality was a result of its curriculum—a conclusion unusual in these case studies. Second was a usual conclusion: the principal (post-contract). She was the leader of the school, she visited classes often, she kept close watch on student achievement, and she established and maintained a firm tone of and procedures for discipline. Lastly, the climate of the school was family-like: parents enthusiastically supported the school and the school supported the parents by, among other things, encouraging parents to visit the school at any time, and showing parents what they could do on their own to improve the achievement of their children. The entire staff thought of itself as a family. Among the most important members of the staff were the head cook, the security guard, and the maintenance supervisor, all of whom took a personal interest in the children by, for example, teaching table manners, supervising, and disciplining the children when they noticed infractions of school rules. Additionally, the student population had become smaller, and the school found that the decrease in enrollment coincided with the increase in achievement.

School Number Two (grades K-6) in Indianapolis was a small, inner-city elementary school set in an integrated neighborhood (35 percent black) whose student body was largely eligible for federal Chapter I compensatory education funds. The research team decided to investigate Number Two because it met their definition of an exceptional school: the school had improved or maintained achievement over a four-year period. More important than any other factor identified by the team as responsible for the school's success was—again—the principal. As a manager, she always made her objectives clear, filtered away unnecessary interruptions from the teachers, and always kept the staff informed by frequent meetings. She had high expectations for herself, the teachers, and the children, and she gave instruction top priority. She treated her teachers in a highly professional manner. Disciplined herself, she supported the teachers in disciplinary matters. Finally, she took a personal interest in the staff and their families and fostered a cohesiveness and sense of belonging at the school. Besides the principal, the research team considered the remedial reading program very important, and they also thought crucial the activities of the community aide who encouraged parents to take an active role in guiding their children to greater academic achievement.

Mary French Elementary School (K-6) in Decatur, Illinois, a blue collar town, enrolled a student population of 375 children of whom 42 percent were black and 26 percent qualified for federally subsidized lunches. Additionally, the trend in the student population was to lower SES levels. The research team that visited Mary French identified this school as one where student academic performance was at or above the district average over a five-year period. This achievement level was true for the whole school, for the minority segment of the school, and for the lowest-achieving quartile of the student body. The causes of the school's success, the team thought, were the schoolwide stress on basic skills, the shared commitment of the faculty and administration, high expectations for the students and consequent demands upon them, detailed structuring of instructional time, and an open-door policy for parents. The principal was considered something of a maverick and was not afraid to take on the system for the sake of some end she found important. Lastly, Mary French was an object of affection in the community. It was regarded by all as a "neighborhood school." To the students, faculty, and community, an important event in the history of the school had been the recent possibility that the school would be closed. Instead, the school was remodeled and another school was consolidated into it. Seemingly, this had focused the attention of everyone on the school and united them in affection and respect for it.

The student population at West Vigo Elementary School in West Terre Haute, Indiana was all-white, and 35 percent of the students qualified for federal lunch programs. West Vigo enrolled 623 students in grades K-5.

Over a seven-year period encompassing the tenure of two principals, this new school, formed from the consolidation of three other elementary schools, threw in its lot with "affective" education. "There was a concerted effort to instill a feeling of worth in each individual student and to make every effort to praise accomplishments, while deemphasizing failures,"[15] reported the researchers. This pedagogical strategy was very specifically implemented in the reading program that the school called EAS (Enjoyment; Affective; Skills) which included detailed goals and subgoals in Enjoyment and Affective plus a more traditional scheme of performance objectives in the Skills area. The researchers attributed some evidence of improvement in reading to the EAS program but did not consider whether the improvement was linked to the entire program or individual components of it.

Besides the EAS program and the schoolwide emphasis on "affective dimensions," the research team thought that the physical move into a new building was a morale-building event for students and teachers and that two "dynamic leadership personalities"[16] as principals, one of whom particularly emphasized parental relations, were the other important factors in the success of the school.

In Fort Wayne, Indiana, the L. C. Ward Elementary School (K-6) enrolled 426 students of whom 48 percent qualified for compensatory education assistance and of whom 75 percent were black and 16 percent white. The research team concluded: "The appointment of a new principal, the assignment of five different teachers in the fall of 1975, and the gradual stabilization of the neighborhood set the stage for the emergence of an exceptional urban school program."[17] The new principal improved communication with the staff, enforced discipline, motivated students with "school spirit" and awards events, and encouraged parents to be involved in and feel welcome at the school. With an emphasis on reading and math, Ward students seemed to have exceeded the normal expectations for inner-city minority children—although the researchers would only say that the students "generally appear"[18] to be achieving at a higher level than many urban school students. Lastly, a threatened school closing was a "critical incident" that brought staff, teachers, parents and the community together through working for a common objective.

What Makes An Effective School?

In 1979 the National Institute of Education and the Institute for Educational Leadership, a private foundation, joined to cosponsor the Journalism Research Fellowships,[19] a project that commissioned six experienced education reporters to report on unusually effective schools in their states. Janet Kolodzy of the *Arkansas Democrat* used the case study method exclusively, and her series on seven high schools is summarized below. For each school, the single most prominent reason for success, as interpreted from Kolodzy's articles, will be listed.

Garland High School, of Garland, Arkansas, a small farming community, enrolled only seventy-four students of whom 90 percent were black. Garland was facing consolidation into another school. But the school had received an "A" rating in the state's accreditation process. Everyone in the community agreed that any success the school had attained was due, to a large extent, to the school's small size "because teachers can spend more time with each child."[20] Another virtue of smallness was that "parents not only know each teacher personally, they know every student in the school, and almost every parent."[21] The high school in Arkansas City, a tiny town whose economic life was dominated by a single factory, sent 50 percent of its small graduating class to college each year. Again, the liabilities of smallness were compensated for by the virtues of smallness: "Parents feel it can offer students individual attention from teachers, a sense of belonging and participation, and a good atmosphere for learning."[22] Students reported that there was a "greater sense of cooperation."[23]

Students in the high school in Russellville, a small, middle-class town, did *not* excel although everyone thought that they should. Revenues from the construction and operation of a nuclear power plant in the area enabled the town to quintuple its per-pupil expenditures over a ten-year period so that the high school had facilities and a curriculum that "many Arkansas high school principals only dream of."[24] But the school did not have the spark of purpose and ambition for excellence exhibited in the descriptions of other schools in these pages. Kolodzy quoted the school superintendent who, speaking about Russellville, said that "money helps, but it takes more. It takes dedication, enthusiasm."[25] The same problem seemed to be influential at Walnut Ridge High School where a general apathy and indifference to learning may have been caused, according to the school's guidance counselor, by a loss of "parental concern and cooperation."[26]

The success of Little Rock's Catholic High School, one of the leading academic high schools in the state, could be attributed to the clear purpose of its principal who had been at the school thirty years, extremely strong involvement by parents, its climate of respect and discipline, and its emphasis on academics. Over a four-year period, the public high school in Arkadelphia, a college town, had been under the leadership of three principals, each with a different approach to school management, discipline and staffing. The school had apparently been able to maintain its overall academic performance because of an experienced faculty and because such a sizable percentage of the student body came from homes of highly-educated parents associated with the college.

The public high school in Greenwood, a small farming and suburban community, had no discipline problems and seemed to be successful because of its small size, its ability to attract good teachers, and its location in a "family-oriented, religious community."[27]

Making Schools Work

Robert Benjamin, a reporter for the *Cincinnati Post*, expanded his original Institute for Educational Leadership fellowship into a book, *Making Schools Work,*[28] which was published in 1981. Benjamin set out to find examples of inner-city public schools in which "the children of the urban poor" were learning more than the nationwide averages on achievement tests said they should.

Fifty percent of the children attending school at the Beasley Academic Center in Chicago resided across the street in a sixteen-building, 4000-unit public housing complex where life was so dangerous that even the police would not enter. Placing a showcase academic program in what would otherwise have been a forlorn ghetto elementary school was the idea of the district superintendent, Alice Blair, who said that her "biggest job has been getting teachers and principals to believe all kids can learn. I didn't want them sitting around talking about the socio-economic situation of the children, what they had for breakfast and all that. I wanted them to know the skills they were to teach and to give the kids a lot of practice in those skills."[29] When Blair became superintendent, she instituted a district-wide emphasis on basic skills, including prescribing textbooks, discipline and dress code, nightly homework, phonics, and reading standards for promotion to high school. Additionally, she required parents to sign a contract indicating their support of her program. Still Blair was not satisfied. She wanted an individual school to serve as her flagship and proof that all students can learn. Exhibiting adroit political skills, she cajoled, begged, persuaded, and argued with her superiors in the Chicago public school system for what was in essence a chance to have a de-regulated school. As Benjamin reported: "What counted was a greater-than-normal degree of control over who would work there."[30] Blair thought that the principal was the key to a school's success. She wanted a principal who would be very visible to the student body and the staff, would be a frequent visitor to classes, and was a keen evaluator of teachers. Having found the kind of person she was looking for, she gave him the opportunity to handpick two-thirds of his teachers—double the number the normal principal was allowed to pick. Finally, Blair invited the best students from around the district to apply to Beasley—a selectivity factor that, it must be admitted, considerably colors the whole undertaking.

What resulted was an almost completely black school with a long waiting list that included whites, the top attendance rate in the Chicago school system, a contented and excellent teaching staff, and a school with every grade exceeding the local and national average test scores. In summarizing the accomplishment, Blair said: "My idea was that, if you could take a certain kind of principal committed to basic education, as many outstanding teachers as you could find and some parental involvement, then you could create an outstanding school—no matter where it was."[31]

Benjamin visited the Garrison School in the notorious "Fort Apache" area of the South Bronx where one-third of the population were on welfare, where hundreds of acres of buildings were in ruins, and where crime and drugs were rampant. The human and material devastation was everywhere—except at the Garrison School where it was not permitted by the heroic efforts of Garrison's principal, Carol Russo. Through her efforts, this school, where half the student population was black and half Hispanic, had reading scores meeting or exceeding normal achievement standards—the only school accomplishing that feat in a district where the average scores of most of the other sixteen elementary schools were in the bottom 20 percent.

Russo, Benjamin reported, had two qualities that seemed to define her success: she was a self-described "political animal," and she was prodigiously organized. Russo realized that the social environment in which Garrison School found itself must be dealt with or it would overcome the school. So whereas other principals shied away from the constant attention that bureaucrats, politicians, and the political system require, Russo was able to have her school building renovated regularly, get burned-out buildings adjacent to the school torn down, direct social services and resources to needy students and their families, and rid the school of incompetent teachers while replacing them with handpicked successors.

With a great capacity for planning and detail, Russo had the school day and a very complex, multi-tracked, multifaceted curriculum that emphasized reading organized and running like a fine clock. "She takes everything seriously to the nth degree . . . She is very demanding,"[32] a colleague told Benjamin. "Structure," Russo said, "It's very, very important."[33] Interestingly enough, she did not regard herself primarily as an instructional leader but as an institutional leader. Benjamin concluded that her success was the result of "frequent testing, a lot of communication, and Mrs. Russo's planning and will."[34] Russo might implicitly have summed up her success with more insight when she said that Garrison was "my baby,"[35] for the totality of her devotion to the children, their families, the neighborhood and the school coupled with her attention to the smallest details seemed quite like the compelling, instinctive love of a mother for her baby.

Benjamin's visit to the Edison School in Madison Heights, Michigan, in 1979 was of particular interest. He went there to report on the decline in achievement at one of the exemplary, high-achieving schools (White A) visited by Brookover and his team in 1975. At that time, Brookover identified a school where the principal was an instructional leader and highly visible in the school, where there were high expectations for academic success for all students, where students and teachers worked hard, and where there was active support from the community. Four years later, Benjamin found a complete change in the school—although it had the same principal. But the principal had changed his educational philosophy. Having grown "disillusioned" with the basic skills emphasis that he had put into place, the principal had adopted a "more humanistic approach" to education that emphasized the "affective domain" rather than academic achievement.

Benjamin's account of his visit to the Byck School in Louisville, Kentucky was his most intriguing chapter. Here was a school with a strong leader, a reputation as Louisville's best inner-city elementary school, and about which students and parents were very enthusiastic.

In the early 1970's Byck's student body was almost entirely black, its curriculum was highly structured, the academic achievement of its students was improving at their grade levels, and their student body achievement exceeded that of all other Louisville inner-city schools. In 1975, court-ordered school busing changed Byck's enrollment from 100 percent black to predominantly white. Byck's principal proved to be a human relations genius amidst the consequent difficulties and anxieties of teachers, parents, and students. When dozens of parents followed their children to school on the first day of busing, Byck's principal invited them in and asked them if they were willing to help out. With the principal leading the way, and with the collaboration of the entire school staff including guidance counselors and maintenance men, the principal established Byck as a school that made the concerns and problems of parents, students, and the community its own concerns and problems. The result was a school that all parents, black and white, high- and low-income, valued deeply.

Yet, this human relations triumph seemed to have obscured some academic problems. Unlike other effective schools, Byck's success with low-income and minority students was arguably deficient. Academic achievement for the school as a whole was comparatively high, but a careful scrutiny by Benjamin revealed that the middle-class children were doing well but that lower-income children, white and black, were not reading at grade level. Furthermore, the principal had abdicated the job as instructional leader to an instructional coordinator and was not even very much involved with instruction but, instead, occupied himself with community and school-system relations. This left the instructional coordinator in the position of being the only administrator who was aware of the quality of the jobs the teachers were doing but who was without the authority to evaluate them. Lastly, the school had no overall commitment to rigor and accomplishment in the basic skills, and close step-by-step attention to student progress. Benjamin saw a school with a strong sense of togetherness and community with little strife and few problems but no real academic accomplishments. He aptly titled his chapter about Byck, "The Limit of Human Relations."

Conclusion

The three most important characteristics of effective schools seem to be discipline, leadership, and structured attention to the basic skills. Of the three, discipline is omnipresent. This chapter contains no example of an effective, permissive school. The major finding of effective schools research has sounded the death-knell of the permissive era in education.

Nearly every school described here had a principal who was a strong leader. Those schools where the role of the principal did not seem absolutely critical received leadership from elsewhere, usually from the next highest level of authority, the superintendent. It might even be said that those schools that operated with the kind of super-structured curricular materials that minimize the influence of teachers got a strong sense of direction, that is to say, of leadership, from those materials. Whatever the source of leadership, the effective schools were headed in a definite direction. The few examples of ineffective schools included here were characterized by a lack of, or recent loss of, direction. So necessary does leadership seem to a productive school that even though Black B had a principal who strongly emphasized academics, Brookover was still critical of her for not igniting the fire of determination and a sense of mission at her school.

Despite the necessity of leadership, usually supplied by the principal, it cannot be said that any particular style of leadership predominated. These pages have included descriptions of successful principals who both did and did not take a strong hand in the curriculum, instructional activities, and instructional philosophy; who tried to free teachers from administrative chores to allow them to concentrate on instruction and who, in contrast, involved teachers in administration and discipline in order to foster a sense of community at their schools; who visited classes often and who visited them seldom.

Despite this plurality of styles, the one seemingly necessary detail of leadership is to instill in the school staff a sense that the school day matters, that the hours spent in school can effect improvements in the lives of the students, and that the school staff must take personal responsibility for the academic progress of the children and be personally insulted if the students do not progress. This spirit is aptly expressed by a first grade teacher at Washington Park Elementary School: "We demand more from the children. We expect them to do well. We know they're going to do well. And they will do well!"[36] Through singular dedication, individual teachers might have this spirit, but it seems inevitably the duty of the principal to require it as a condition of employment. Overall, it seems that a school's leader must create and nurture a pervasive sense of worthwhileness, that is to say simply, a sense that attendance at school is a worthwhile way to spend one's time.

A structured attention to the basic skills is the third prominent characteristic of effective schools. Children will not learn the basic academic skills of reading and counting without an explicit decision that this is the mission of their schools. Such a decision, of course, requires as a precondition a conviction about the fundamental purpose of a school. Effective schools research seems to say that good academic results are coming from schools that are not confused about what to teach and why to teach it. Additionally, the teaching of the basics requires a detailed and structured pedagogical strategy that includes intermediate goals, continuous diagnosis and testing, and remediation. Without a high percentage of the school day being spent in engaged time learning the basics, the basics will not be learned. The effective school is the school organized to promote this engagement.

In closing, some caveats are in order. First, despite the inclusion in these pages of the Kolodzy writings about a wide variety of schools, the student populations at the schools that have been studied by effective school researchers come almost exclusively from low-income, minority families. Additionally, the studies are of elementary schools predominantly. A scientific view demands, therefore, that any conclusions drawn from this research be confined to discussions of those schools, and this is so despite the unavoidable tendency to view discipline and leadership as obvious school virtues at any level. Second, too much effective schools research, including some of the works reviewed here, is excessively impressionistic and not rigorous enough in the collection and analysis of hard statistics on the schools being studied. Schools which seem to be unusually effective in teaching low-income, minority children may, upon a closer look, be schools located in neighborhoods that are in transition from working class to middle class. Such a transition might account for the observed improvement in academic achievement. Third, the fundamental relationship of cause to effect is not always obvious. For example, is discipline a cause of effectiveness, or is some other cause of effectiveness (a strong principal, e.g.) the cause of discipline? Fourth, can the specific strengths of a particular school be applied to other schools? In other words, can the virtues of Carol Russo, Roger Haynes, and Alice Blair be duplicated elsewhere, or are they inextricably tied to the people who make those schools what they are?

Nevertheless, the great contribution of effective schools research is that it has confirmed the importance of the moral and spiritual climate prevailing at a school. In the past, research comparing schools and the performance of schools has emphasized comparisons of "quantitative" matters such as comparative average expenditures per student; the size, cost, and age of buildings; and the sizes of tax bases. Effective schools research has focused attention on "qualitative" matters such as the excellence of the principal's leadership, the sense of group agreement on a common goal, the belief in the importance of academics, discipline, and a family-like school atmosphere.

The example of Carol Russo in the South Bronx is convincing. No salary increase could persuade most people to take on such a job. Millions of tax dollars for education improvement and for urban development seem paltry in the face of such chaos. But in this worst of all possible urban worlds, a school succeeded because one woman regarded it as "my baby."

Notes

1. State superintendent of schools, Roy Truby, in "*Pauley v. Bailey and the West Virginia Master Plan*;" Roy Truby, *Phi Delta Kappan*, December 1983, p. 285.
2. *State Programs of School Improvement: A 50-State Survey*, (Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1983).
3. Socio-Economic Status—normally defined to mean family income plus parental education.
4. See Stuart C. Purkey and Marshall S. Smith, "Effective Schools: A Review," *Elementary School Journal*, March 1983, pp. 427-52.
5. George Weber, "Inner City Children Can Be Taught To Read: Four Successful Schools," Council for Basic Education, Occasional Papers Number Eighteen, 725 15th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20005.
6. Ibid., p. 18.
7. Ibid., p. 19.
8. Ibid., p. 20.
9. Ibid., p. 24.
10. Ibid., p. 22.
11. Wilbur Brookover with Charles Beady, Patricia Flood, John Schweitzer, Joe Wisenbaker, *School Social Systems and Student Achievement*, (New York: Praeger, 1979).
12. Ibid., p. 80.
13. Phi Delta Kappa, *Why Do Some Urban Schools Succeed?*, (Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1980).
14. Ibid., p. 92.
15. Ibid., p. 48.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid., p. 53.
18. Ibid., p. 56.
19. *The Journalism Research Fellowships Report: What Makes An Effective School?* (Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1980).
20. Ibid., p. 3.
21. Ibid., pp. 3-4.
22. Ibid., p. 5.
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid., p. 6.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid., p. 8.
27. Ibid., p. 9.
28. Robert Benjamin, *Making Schools Work*, (N.Y.: Continuum Publishing Corporation, 1981).
29. Ibid., p. 19.
30. Ibid., p. 20.
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid., p. 111.

33. Ibid., p. 109.
34. Ibid.
35. Ibid., p. 108.
36. Phi Delta Kappa, *Why Do Some Urban Schools Succeed?*, (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1980).

EIGHT

Robin Hood Goes to School: The Case for a Federal Voucher Program

Lawrence A. Uzzell

America's public schools are pretty bad. Most observant laymen have known this for some time, but only recently have the people who run these schools started to admit it. Like the status of blacks on the eve of the civil-rights revolution, public-school mediocrity has finally become an officially sanctioned crisis.

But there is little agreement on what to do about it. If the civil-rights parallel holds, we can expect today's kindergartners to become assistant professors in the time it will take us to reach such agreement and then put it into practice. Thus, for millions of children the only realistic short-term hope of decent schooling lies in the private sector.

If our sole purpose were to help as many of these children as possible, the case for tuition tax credits would be irresistible. But opponents of tax credits make two counterarguments. First, they claim that the principle of "equity" for social groups outweighs the principle of freedom of choice for individuals. Second, they claim that tuition tax credits would violate this principle by taking from the poor to give to the rich, or at least to the middle class. They portray themselves as Robin Hoods, protecting the oppressed from the wicked Sheriff of Nottingham as played by Ronald Reagan.

Note that *both* these counterarguments must be true for the case against tuition tax credits to stand. If the first is true but the second false, then the case against tax credits collapses. Therefore, you can be a liberal and still support tuition tax credits. If you are a really pure liberal who applies the "Robin Hood" standard consistently, then you *must* support tuition tax credits.

Here is why. The federal tax system as currently structured allows taxpayers to deduct their state and local tax payments from their taxable incomes. It thereby provides massive indirect tax breaks to public schools. But these tax breaks are not at all neutral in their effects on different categories of parents and of schools. They help homeowners more than renters, suburbanites more than city-dwellers, rich neighborhoods more than poor neighborhoods, and whites more than blacks. They encourage parents who can afford it to move from city to suburb, and thus in effect promote racial separation. They have no upper limit: they help the super-rich more than the moderately rich, and are therefore consistently regressive in their effects on how the federal tax burden is distributed.

In every one of these respects, tuition tax credits would be more egalitarian than the existing tax code.

Consider a hypothetical example. Mr. and Mrs. Louis Noblesse are corporate lawyers with a combined income of $100,000. They rent an apartment in an integrated urban neighborhood for $1,000 a month. Mr. and Mrs. Noblesse want their two children to have the best education they can afford. If they stay in the city, that means paying $4,000 per child for annual tuition to an elite private school, or $8,000 in total. The alternative is to buy a home in a wealthy suburb, which will cost $25,000 a year in mortgage and property-tax payments. (Most of the property tax is in effect a tuition payment to the suburban public school, which is intellectually almost as exclusive as the urban private school, and socially a lot more exclusive.) But most of this

$25,000 figure is deductible, and since the Noblesse family occupies the highest tax bracket a federal tax deduction is worth a lot to them—say $10,000. Thus, their real cost of housing and schooling in the suburbs will be only $15,000, while the total cost of housing and schooling in the city is $20,000. The Noblesse family would be crazy not to move.

Compare Mr. and Mrs. George Bourgeois, who earn $35,000 a year and can buy a suburban house whose annual mortgage and property-tax payments total only $12,000. The Bourgeois family occupies a medium-high tax bracket, so their deduction will be worth $2,000 and their real cost of housing and schooling in the suburbs will be $10,000. The alternative is to stay in the city, paying $8,400 in rent plus $2,000 in tuition to a decent Catholic school, not one penny of which is deductible. They will probably move.

Note that Mr. and Mrs. Noblesse get a federal tax break of $10,000 and Mr. and Mrs. Bourgeois a tax break of only $2,000. But Mr. and Mrs. Sam Prole, who earn $10,000 a year, get no tax break at all. They cannot afford to buy a home in the suburbs, nor can they afford to send their children to a private or parochial school. Their children are stuck in a mediocre, government-operated school, and their neighborhood is drained of middle- and upper-income families thanks to the unintended incentives of the federal tax system.[1]

But behold the superiority of tuition tax credits. Unlike a deduction, a credit offers the same relief to every taxpayer regardless of income. It helps renters just as much as homeowners, city-dwellers as much as suburbanites—and blacks more than whites, since blacks are more likely than whites to be the captive customers of monopoly government schools under the status quo. Since private schools are generally more integrated than public schools, it also advances the goal of mingling children from diverse racial and economic backgrounds.

Suppose you are such a thoroughgoing egalitarian that the only goals you care about are wealth, redistribution and racial integration; that you are completely indifferent to issues like parental freedom and academic excellence.

Even on that basis, you have to be for tax credits once you compare them with the existing system.

In fact, you have to conclude that there is only one, forgivable defect in the tuition tax credits proposals to date: they do not go far enough.

They do not go far enough, because they do not provide financial assistance to those families who are so poor that they do not pay any taxes at all. If you are not a taxpayer, you cannot get a tax credit, even though your children would benefit indirectly from the results of other parents getting tax credits. What you need is a voucher system.

Education vouchers would help the poor buy schooling in the same way that food stamps, rent subsidies, Medicaid, and Pell grants for college tuition help them buy other social services. In these other social programs, the government uses transfer payments to support consumer choices. The citizen decides where to live, convalesce, study, or buy groceries; and the government signs the check. If anyone were to suggest that the poor should be allowed to receive these subsidies only if they agree to patronize a state-operated monopoly, the hills would echo with the cry of "Paternalism!" But for some reason, the poor are treated as if they were incompetent to make intelligent decisions in one and only one area of their lives: elementary and secondary education. Vouchers would change that by directing government subsidies to individuals, not institutions.

But with a budget deficit that may soon exceed $200 billion, Congress might not be comfortable with the idea of a voucher system that could easily cost three times as much as the Reagan proposal for tuition tax credits. Fortunately, a Congressional staffer has already figured out a way around that problem. Just tap into an education program that already exists, is already budgeted at $3 billion a year, and is already targeted to the poor. Retain the program's existing focus on disadvantaged children, but make it consumer-oriented rather than provider-oriented, pluralistic rather than statist, competitive rather than monopolistic. Get rid of the assumption that the poor cannot be trusted.[2]

This existing program is called Chapter One of the

Education Consolidation and Improvement Act.[3] It is the biggest single program in the U.S. Department of Education. Transforming it into a voucher system would be the single most radically egalitarian and populist act in the history of American education.

Late in 1982, President Reagan's Advisory Panel on Financing Elementary and Secondary Education proposed just that.[4] A few months later, the President announced the "Equal Educational Opportunity Act."

Mr. Reagan's proposal does not go as far as his advisory panel recommended, but it is still a dramatic step in a new direction. Instead of restructuring the entire $3 billion Chapter One budget, the Reagan bill would leave the decision to state and local governments. Dollars would continue as before to flow to communities with disadvantaged children, but for the first time a state legislature or local school board would be allowed to distribute some or all of its Chapter One funds to individual families in the form of vouchers.

The text of the Equal Educational Opportunity Act is only half as long as the current version of Chapter One. Most of it consists of safeguards to prevent vouchers from going to parents who choose schools that practice racial discrimination. These provisions are copied almost verbatim from the Administration's tuition tax credit bill, in which setting they have already received strong bipartisan support from the members of the Senate Finance Committee.

As recommended by the advisory panel, the Reagan proposal is designed to help full-time, not part-time, students. The child who transfers from a public school to a private school, or to a public school outside his own district, would be eligible for a voucher. But the voucher could not be used for, say, evening piano lessons from a private tutor.

The focus of this voucher proposal, unlike some others which have been discussed, is the child's core educational program, rather than supplementary services. If that program is not satisfactory, parents should have the means to select the best alternative they can find. They should not have to settle for a few hours a week of supplemental patchwork. But if the child needs a lot of remedial work in reading, parents can choose whatever school they think has the best remedial program. The key point is that it will now be the *parents* who make that choice—not local administrators or Washington rule-writers and auditors.

This bill was drafted with meticulous attention to the fears of those who see any voucher system as a potential threat to the independence of independent schools. Recent events have proved these fears to be all too valid.[5] So it is important that legislative draftsmen do everything possible to minimize the dangers. The Equal Educational Opportunity Act states that "Payments made by a local educational agency to a private school or to another local educational agency pursuant to an educational voucher program under this chapter shall not constitute Federal financial assistance to the local educational agency or private school receiving such payments, and use of funds under the chapter received in exchange for a voucher by a private school or by a public school located outside of the school district in which the eligible child resides shall not constitute a program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

If the enemies of educational freedom were honest, that would end the issue. They would recognize that the only way they could bring private schools under their regulatory yoke would be to amend the law, and they could never muster the votes in Congress for such an amendment. But they are not honest. As the history of racial quotas since the 1964 Civil Rights Act has clearly shown, they have no scruples about interpreting a law to mean the direct opposite of what the law says.[6]

Thus, the autonomy of private schools in this country will always be at risk, no matter what the law says. Fundamentalist Christians who think that they can keep their schools secure by defeating voucher and tax-credit plans are simply mistaken: the state of Nebraska has no voucher plan, but powerful forces in that state have worked diligently to outlaw private schools whose teachers are not products of state-sanctioned training programs.[7] The surest protection for private schools is a large and well-informed constituency, and this voucher plan will help build such a constituency.

As fundamentalist leader Robert Baldwin has observed, "While opposition to tuition tax credits is no solution to control, neither is giving up one constitutional liberty in order to protect another. . . . Christian schools and parents must not give up their rights for fear of what might happen. They must demand what is rightfully theirs and fight for it to the end. If they lose, then they should be willing to continue without the use of their own educational tax dollars, but not before they have tried to retain that right. To give up without a struggle would not be good stewardship of what God has given."[8]

Like tuition tax credits, the voucher plan would help to reverse what Texas sociologist Lucy Patterson called "a dangerous trend which has even intensified during the Reagan era. Schools have been getting more and more politicized. Until recently, the most active political elements came from the left, with pacifists, feminists, and environmentalists all seeking to reshape textbooks and courses according to their own imperatives. None of these groups has slackened its efforts, but they have now been joined by equally well-organized forces from the other end of the spectrum. All of these activists feel a sense of mission to the young, and all seek to harness the power of government monopoly to help them advance that mission."

Mrs. Patterson rightly accuses "some of the right-wing and all of the left-wing groups" of failing to see "that nobody in a free society has the right to force-feed his own ideology to another's children without the other person's consent. In a society as incredibly diverse as late Twentieth-Century America, the only way we can all live at peace with one another is to take volatile issues like feminism, sex education, and creationism out of the 'winner-take-all' arena of monopoly education. There will always be a fundamentalist Christian minority in San Francisco, and there will always be a Unitarian minority (or its equivalent) in Alabama. Unless these minorities have a realistic option to send their children to schools consistent with their own vision of the truth, the politics of public education will keep growing harsher, shriller, and more depressing."[9]

The existing, pre-voucher Chapter One program obviously contributes nothing to the cause of depoliticizing schools. But this is not the only respect in which new-style Chapter One is superior to old-style Chapter One.

Old-style Chapter One favors some disadvantaged children over others, but new-style Chapter One treats all children equally. The original intent of Congress in enacting the Chapter One program in 1965 was to provide "equitable services" for disadvantaged children in private as well as government schools. But the program was, and is, set up in such a way as to make it impossible in practice for private-school students to get their fair share. Since all substantive decision-making under the existing structure is in the hands of Federal, state, and local government agencies, the program inevitably discriminates against students in non-government schools.

For example, a recent study found that only one-fourth of the local school districts receiving Chapter One funds served *any* students in private schools.[10] By transferring effective control to individual parents, new-style Chapter One would immediately and automatically end this inequity.

Even if government-school officials were completely even-handed in the way they distributed funds, old-style Chapter One would still be unfair to private schools because of its requirement that the money can only be used to pay for teachers hired and supervised by the government and for classes controlled by the government. For example, suppose that St. Mary's School has a dozen disadvantaged children who are eligible for Chapter One services. Under the existing structure, the only way those services can be provided is for St. Mary's to set up a separate classroom which will be visited by a teacher who is an employee of the local *public* school system. No matter how superior St. Mary's own faculty may be, and no matter how much St. Mary's parents may desire continuity and cohesiveness in their children's school experience, old-style Chapter One money may not go to any class which St. Mary's actually controls. Thus, the *status quo* allows independent schools merely to *host* Chapter One classes, not to *run* them. But under new-style Chapter One, vouchers could be used to support classes that are genuinely independent.

Another advantage of new-style Chapter One is that it will begin to substitute local creativity and flexibility for the cumbersome, top-heavy regulations that characterize old-style Chapter One. For example, the existing structure forces schools to organize their programs in a way that pays more attention to the convenience of Federal auditors than to the needs of teachers and children. In a typical Chapter One school, disadvantaged children spend most of the school day in the same classroom with the same teacher as their non-disadvantaged peers. But for part of the day—perhaps an hour—they are pulled out of the regular classroom to receive separate instruction in a separate classroom from a separate teacher or teacher-aide. *Usually, their regular class continues in session at the same time.* After the children return from their Chapter One session, their regular teacher may or may not be willing and able to help them catch up with whatever material they missed. By its very nature, Chapter One thus tends to aggravate the problems of cohesion and control which plague today's impersonal, bureaucratized public schools.[11] This is not to say that schools should never provide specialized tutors for children with special needs. But the schools should be able to make such decisions according to their own educational criteria, not monolithic Federal requirements.

In spite of all these arguments for reform, the vested interests which benefit from old-style Chapter One have made it clear that they are not willing to consider any fundamental changes in the program. They have developed several arguments against the Equal Educational Opportunity Act, which they presented at a Congressional hearing in April 1983. Every one of their arguments is self-serving, paternalistic, or both.

First, they argue that Chapter One is a "successful" program and should therefore be left unchanged. They cite studies by the National Assessment of Educational Progress which find that test scores of elementary-school children, and especially of black children, have recently been rising. They point out that these are precisely the groups targeted by Chapter One, and from this they infer a cause-and-effect relationship.

This argument is a classic example of the ancient logical fallacy, *post hoc ergo propter hoc*. There are several other possible explanations of recent improvements in elementary education: for example, the back-to-basics movement began to have real impact only in the last half of the 1970's. (Chapter One, in contrast, has been in effect since 1965, and it is universally agreed that for at least the first half of its history, test scores at all levels of schooling were going down.)

A truly rigorous evaluation of Chapter One would systematically, comprehensively compare the achievement gains of Chapter One children and of *comparable* non-Chapter One children. The National Assessment has never done this. Other studies of Federal compensatory education programs vary widely in scope and quality, but for the most part their findings are considerably less favorable than one would ever guess from the press releases of old-style Chapter One's defenders. Two researchers at the University of Pennsylvania recently analyzed 47 of these studies. They found that participants had a slight edge over non-participants, that the efforts were probably not sustained, that there was no significant correlation between spending and achievement gains, and that no particular approach or program characteristic was found to be consistently effective.[12] In light of the fact that Washington has spent some $40 billion since 1965 on compensatory education, these results are hardly impressive.

But for the sake of argument, suppose that old-style Chapter One is just as successful as its lobbyists claim. Even if that were the case, and if new-style Chapter One were enacted, there would be nothing to stop schools from continuing to spend their Chapter One funds on exactly the same activities as under the old *regime--if* the parents had the same high opinion of those activities as the administrators. If old-style Chapter One's advocates are as sure of the program's merits as they claim, they should welcome the chance to let parents give them a vote of confidence.

But this brings us to another of the arguments against vouchers. Lobbyists like Mary Futrell of the National Education Association claim, or at least strongly imply, that lower-income parents are not now able to make the best educational decisions on their own—that these parents need to be controlled by better-informed experts. Unlike more old-fashioned elitists, Mrs. Futrell attributes this incapacity not to genetic defects but to the way "this nation has 'colonized' many of its poor and minority communities."[13] But if colonialism is the problem, it would seem that decolonization-freedom is the solution. If we applied the same kind of logic to the Third World that Mrs. Futrell applies to American minorities, we would have to return huge chunks of Africa and Asia to European rule.

The fact of the matter is that blacks, Hispanics, and other minorities are perfectly capable of distinguishing between mediocrity and excellence in education. Indeed, they have proved more immune than affluent WASP suburbanites to the romantic, self-indulgent follies which crippled American education in the 1960's and 1970's. As social theorist Christopher Lasch observed, black parents during this period "clung to what seems today an old-fashioned—from the point of view of educational 'innovators,' a hopelessly reactionary—conception of education. According to this supposedly traditional view, the school functions best when it transmits the basic skills on which literate societies depend, upholds high standards of academic excellence, and sees to it that students make these standards their own."[14] In other words, black parents continued to prize what used to be called "Western civilization" and is today called "middle-class values."

During the two decades since old-style Chapter One was first authorized by Congress, researchers have put considerable effort into studying effective schools, both public and private. From this effort, shared by liberals, neoconservatives, and paleoconservatives, has emerged a remarkable consensus. It is today generally agreed that effective schools share the following characteristics: strong leadership from the principal, orderly classrooms, emphasis on the core academic skills, and a climate of shared values.[15] The presence or absence of these qualities is far more decisive than the size of a school's budget.[16]

This new consensus has an interesting similarity to Aristotelian ethics and supply-side economics: it is a scholarly reaffirmation of common sense. When the prejudices of government school officials and of grass-roots parents are both put to the most rigorous empirical tests we can devise, it turns out that the parents are more nearly right. For example, surveys of popular attitudes toward education have repeatedly found that discipline is at or near the top of the parents' list of concerns, even while the professionals were insisting that the schools' most pressing need was for more money.[17] Even if they have never taken an education course or read a commission report in their lives, parents can see the difference between good schools and bad schools. They do not need to be "protected from themselves" by a monopolistic elite of professionals; in fact, the advent of consumer choice for parents will give the professionals more incentive than ever to work for precisely those changes that are most urgently needed.

Yet another argument advanced by opponents of the Equal Educational Opportunity Act is that it would increase racial segregation. This is perhaps the most brazen of all their arguments, since it is based on mere assertion, with no empirical evidence whatsoever. The government monopolists would like us to think that all private schools are racist. But in fact the average private school is considerably better integrated than the average government school.[18] The most segregated of all schools are the so-called "public" schools in elite suburbs, where "tuition" consists of mortgage payments and property taxes beyond the budgets of all but a tiny fraction of minority families. In inner cities with large concentrations of disadvantaged minority families, it is not uncommon for those families to have only two realistic choices in education: a segregated government school and an integrated school affiliated with the Catholic Church. In Washington, D.C., for example, government school enrollment is more than 90 percent black, while Catholic-school enrollment is about 65 percent black. In fact, 51 percent of the children in Washington's Catholic schools are from non-Catholic families.[19] Even if racial integration were the *only* educational goal that mattered, it is clear that the fastest way to achieve this goal in such a city would be through vouchers.

A close reading of the arguments against vouchers makes it clear that neither racial integration, nor academic performance, nor parental competence is the core issue for the mainstream of the government school establishment. The establishment's leaders are simply not going to be converted by any conceivable new evidence related to these issues; that is why they are unalterably opposed even to small-scale experiments which might test competing predictions about the actual results of vouchers.[20] Their bedrock opposition to vouchers is based not on fact, but on principle.

Shorn of all tinsel, the issue of principle is this: whose child is it? If the answer is "the parents," the burden of proof is on those who would limit, regulate, or deny parental choice. If the answer is "the state," then the burden of proof falls onto the parental mavericks who seek "exemption" from the universal presumption that government is the superior educator.[21]

In 1979 the Association of California School Administrators provided an unusually candid discussion of its reasons for opposing vouchers. "Parent choice," said its report, "proceeds from the belief that the purpose of education is to provide individual students with an education. In fact, educating the individual is but a means to the true end of education—which is to create a viable social order to which individuals contribute and by which they are sustained. 'Family choice,' is, therefore, basically selfish and anti-social in that it focuses on the 'wants' of a single family rather than the 'needs' of society."[22]

Ironically, the most trenchant comment on this reasoning came from Berkeley law professor John Coons, a liberal Democrat who was appointed to the Presidential Advisory Panel on Financing Elementary and Secondary Education by President Carter, and fired by President Reagan. Coons called the Association's statement "another profoundly disturbing revelation of the elitism of public administrators: The school, you tell us, is not to provide the student education but rather to shape him to the social order of which you are the oracles; the human impulse to self-perfection is selfish and destructive of that order and can be tolerated only when exercised by the rich. The fact that you could in all innocence publish such a statement says everything the public now fears about our educational leadership."[23]

The establishment's use of this line of argument against the Chapter One voucher proposal has been less dramatic, but no less disturbing. Mrs. Futrell of the NEA said the bill "seriously undermines the concept of public services . . . (and) opens questions on the viability of police, transportation, and other public services."[24]

Now it happens that Mrs. Futrell's analogy of schools to transportation proves the opposite of what she claims. The movement to deregulate transportation brought together what was perhaps the single broadest coalition of the 1970's, ranging from Milton Friedman to Ralph Nader. Her other example is both more accurate and more revealing. Our century has seen several regimes which succeeded in organizing schools, newspapers, and other such institutions in the same manner as the police. These regimes are called, aptly, "police states."

The debate over the Equal Educational Opportunity Act, if carried out in broad daylight, is a debate that the education establishment cannot win. Most Americans do not agree that children should be treated as wards of the state, or that lower-income parents should have their choices made for them by the same government agencies that have made American education the equivalent of Soviet agriculture. With just a little effort and imagination, the Reagan Administration could do with this bill what it did with the

Kemp-Roth tax cuts in 1981, combining sound policy with smart politics.

Unfortunately, once the bill was introduced the Administration did next to nothing. Secretary of Education Terrel Bell was (and is) preoccupied with efforts like his "technology initiative" and his National Commission on Excellence in Education, which provide the groundwork for creating even more Federal programs and go out of their way to avoid promoting parental choice.[25] When the Secretary appeared before the House Education and Labor Committee to discuss the bill, his performance was so inept that it can be explained only by gross incompetence or deliberate sabotage.

The low point of Bell's testimony came when Congressman George Miller (D-Calif.) asked the Secretary what would happen if a school district found that many of its disadvantaged children wanted to transfer to private schools. Bell replied, "The school district would be totally in control. They could still not permit any of them to move to the new position unless they wanted to. It would be like it is pretty much now, Mr. Chairman, with Public Law 94-142. The parents, the local education officials, and the parents of the children, would have to concur before this would happen. . . . There would need to be a meeting of the parents and local school officials, much like we now have the individualized education plan developed for the private school children, and then the decision could be made on a case-by-case basis as to how it ought to be approved and whether it should or whether it shouldn't."[26]

In other words, Secretary Bell's concept of "parent choice" is that government-school officials would have veto power over any choice they did not like. And his model for the implementation of new-style Chapter One is the Federal program for the education of the handicapped, which is probably the most cumbersome, intrusive, and rule-laden of all Federal education programs. His words reveal not just a failure to understand his own Administration's proposal, but a probably incurable preference for top-down, government-dominated systems of control. It would be hard to imagine an attitude more incompatible with the spirit of the Equal Educational Opportunity Act.

An equally disappointing response to the voucher proposal came from the U.S. Catholic Conference. Richard Duffy, the Conference's education specialist, did not even wait for the details of the new proposal to be revealed, but immediately began passing the word in January of 1983 that the Conference would oppose it.[27] He told the *Washington Post,* "We're very satisfied with the way the current system is working."[28]

Do the views of the Washington staff of the U.S. Catholic Conference on this issue represent the views of Catholic parents and educators across the country? There is at present no way of knowing, for the Washington staff moved to torpedo the voucher proposal before its constituency could learn anything about it.[29]

Since the Equal Educational Opportunity Act was drafted, education reform has become one of the hottest issues in American politics. Half a dozen establishment-dominated task forces and commissions have finally agreed that the problems are serious, and they have proposed scores of changes, ranging from longer school days to compulsory kindergarten to computerized instruction. Unfortunately, these proposals all share one fatal flaw: they are indifferent, even hostile, to freedom. If they were put into effect *en bloc*, the one certain result is that state education officials would have even more power than now, and individual school principals, teachers, and parents would have even less.

If freedom were incompatible with educational excellence, this result might be acceptable. But the experience of the last two decades points to just the opposite view. Precisely as decision-making power has been drawn away from parents and local school boards, and centralized in state capitals and in Washington, we have seen the longest and fastest decline in academic performance in the history of the republic. Freedom—consumer sovereignty—is the only effective way to force the education establishment to pursue those reforms that are good for children but not good for the establishment's self-interest.[30]

Freedom has become the only practical way to advance another educational ideal: equality. Conventional egalitarian tactics have reached a dead end because conventional egalitarians have now achieved everything they can get away with in a democracy. For example, the only way forced busing could be made to "work" would be for the government to dictate where parents may live, and that is simply not going to happen.

But conventional egalitarians forget that there are not one, but two ways to promote equality of opportunity. We can take freedom away from the rich, which does not work. Or we can give freedom to the poor, which does work—and which is precisely what the Equal Educational Opportunity Act will do.

Notes

1. For an especially penetrating analysis of the Federal Tax Code's perverse effects, see Thomas Vitullo-Martin, "How Federal Policies Discourage the Racial and Economic Integration of Private Schools," in Edward M. Gaffney, Jr., ed., *Private Schools and the Public Good: Policy Alternatives for the Eighties*, (Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1981).

2. See Ronald F. Docksai, "Education," in Charles L. Heatherly, ed., *Mandate for Leadership: Policy Management in a Conservative Administration*, (Heritage Foundation, 214 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002, 1981), p. 177. "Even if it did not pass, this proposal would make it impossible for anyone to accuse the Administration of 'middle-class bias' in its advocacy of private-school tuition tax credits. . . . If it *did* pass, the Administration would be rescuing the public-school monopoly's most helpless victims, the inner-city blacks and Hispanics, at a single stroke. This one victory would sound the death-knell for statist education."

3. From 1965 to 1982, the statute authorizing the Federal compensatory education program was *Title* One of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In 1981 Congress passed the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, *Chapter* One of which re-authorized the program and made some minor changes in its structure. For simplicity's sake, the term "Chapter One" is used throughout this essay.

4. *Toward More Local Control: Financial Reform for Public Education*, Final Report of the Advisory Panel on Financing Elementary and Secondary Education, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983), pp. 5-6. "The Panel recommends that Chapter I (Part 4) be voucherized and the states be held accountable. The 'anti-poverty' orientation would remain, but the money (in voucher form) would go directly to the children's parents rather than the public school districts.

Voucherizing the Chapter I program would fulfill the original intent of Congress to provide 'equitable services' for all children including those in private schools. This type of program would not increase the federal deficit because it simply restructures a program that already exists and redirects money that is already being spent. Such a program would give more flexibility to the states." At almost exactly the same time as the Advisory Panel's report, Texas sociologist Lucy Patterson strongly endorsed Chapter One vouchers as a "priority" reform in a study of the Department of Education commissioned by the Heritage Foundation. According to Mrs. Patterson, "No education proposal would do more than this one to help blacks and Hispanics, or to jolt our stagnant schools into the twenty-first century." See Lucy Phelps Patterson, "Education," in Richard N. Holwill, ed., *Agenda '83*, (The Heritage Foundation, 214 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20002, 1983), p. 119.

5. See "Reagan Administration Betrays Christian Schools," *Human Events*, Sept. 10, 1983. The typical fundamentalist Christian school has never received one dime of Federal subsidies, but since 1978 there has been an energetic effort to impose racial quotas on these schools on the alleged ground that tax-exempt status is "Federal financial assistance." See Jeremy Rabkin, "Behind the Tax-exempt Schools Debate," *The Public Interest*, Summer 1982.

6. See Nathan Glazer, *Affirmative Discrimination: Ethnic Inequality and Public Policy*, (New York: Basic Books, 1975); and Lino Graglia, *Disaster by Decree: The Supreme Court Decisions on Race and the Schools*, (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1976).

7. Ironically, graduates of these programs are probably less well-equipped to teach children than the average, randomly chosen college graduate. For a detailed study of a typical state teacher's college (not in Nebraska), see William Thorburn, *What's Wrong with Teacher Education: A Case Study*, LEARN, Inc., Suite 310, 655 15th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005, 1983.

8. Robert Baldwin, "Parents Deserve Tax Credits," *Moral Majority Report*, February 1983.

9. Lucy Phelps Patterson, "Education" in Richard N. Holwill, ed., *Agenda '83*.

10. Richard Jung, *Nonpublic School Students in Title I, ESEA Programs: A Question of 'Equal' Services*, Report to the Planning and Evaluation Service, U.S. Department of Education, Contract No. 300-80-0933, Washington, D.C., September 1, 1982.

11. Rand Corporation researcher Paul Hill concluded after a year-long study of Chapter One that it often causes serious confusion by disrupting the school day. He said children are frequently "taught different skills in the same subject, such as arithmetic, in different sequences. The kids get confused." See Lawrence Feinberg, "Study Says Remedial Programs Often Disrupt Classes," *Washington Post*, Dec. 15, 1981. In 1980 a Chapter One administrator in Washington admitted that if schools were to follow the letter of the law, "you'd have to have the program on Saturdays." See *Education Times*, Feb. 11, 1980.

12. Stephen P. Mullin and Anita A. Summers, "Is More Better? The Effectiveness of Spending on Compensatory Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, January 1983. See also Carl F. Kaestle and Marshall Smith, "The Federal Role in Elementary and Secondary Education, 1940-1980," *Harvard Educational Review*, November 1982: "After almost two decades of intervention, the Title I program stands primarily as a symbol of national concern for the poor, rather than as a viable response to the needs." Also William Cooley, *Educational Leadership*, January 1981: "On balance, Title I is not providing the kind of achievement that people hoped it would have. An unfortunate aspect of the evaluation of Title I is the focus on justifying the Federal funding program by seeking an overall Title I effect, instead of focusing on ways in which Title I practices might be improved." California reading specialist Paul Copperman believes that Chapter One is actually *harmful* to academic achievement: "The mass of federal regulations which public schools must obey when spending this money virtually insures that the money will not be used to serve the needs of children, but in fact will only serve the needs of the politicians who pass the legislation, the bureaucrats who administer it, and the community residents who use it as a jobs program. . . . Compensatory education is little more than an educational boondoggle." Testimony before U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Legislation and National Security, Hearings on the Department of Education Organization Act, March 26, 27 and April 5, 1979.

13. Statement of Mary Hatwood Futrell before the U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, Hearings on the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1983, April 6, 1983. Mrs. Futrell managed to accuse her opponents of the very attitude which her own organization is perpetuating: paternalism. She said, "The effectiveness of a voucher system depends on the kind of information parents have about educational alternatives and on their capacity to use this information well. Advocates of vouchers feel that parents know best about the individual needs and aptitudes of their children. Adequately informed, say these advocates, parents are in the best position to select and oversee the educational environment in which their children are most likely to flourish. Failing to understand how effectively this nation has 'colonized' many of its poor and minority communities leads to the same misguided positions of paternalism and 'noblesse oblige' that distort much of our foreign policy. With good information and real alternatives, poor families are able, or capable of learning in short order, to make as good decisions as anyone else. The critical question, therefore, concerning how poor families might fare under a voucher system is whether real alternatives will be accessible." See also the testimony at the same hearing of Grace Baisinger of the National Coalition for Public Education, who concluded that ". . . it defies reality to assume that most of the parents of the 'very poorest' of the nation's disadvantaged children—who in many cases are themselves the victims of some of society's most difficult social problems—will be aware of and will make the most informed educational choice for their children."

14. Christopher Lasch, *The Culture of Narcissism: American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations*, (New York: Norton, 1979), pp. 248-49.
15. See George Weber, *Inner-City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools*, Council for Basic Education, 725 15th Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005, 1971; Ronald Edmonds, "Some Schools Work and More Can," *Social Policy*, March/April 1979; Michael Cohen, "Effective Schools: Accumulating Research Findings," *American Education*, January/February 1982.
16. See James S. Coleman, *et al.*, *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966); Christopher Jencks *et al*, *Inequality: A Reassessment of Family and Schooling in America*, (New York: Basic Books, 1972).
17. See the Gallup polls on public attitudes toward education which have appeared annually in *Phi Delta Kappan* for the last decade.
18. "About 60 percent of the classmates of the average black student in the private sector are white, as compared with about 38 percent for the average black student in the public schools. . . ." James Coleman, Thomas Hoffer, and Sally Kilgore, *Public and Private Schools*, National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, D.C., 1982, p. 43.
19. Danielle Schultz, "Lessons from America's Best-Run Schools," *Washington Monthly*, November, 1983.
20. ". . . The National Education Association is solidly opposed to the enactment of federal and state legislation promoting voucher feasibility studies. . . ." Legislative Statement, "Voucher Plans," NEA Office of Government Relations, Washington, January, 1983.
21. On this issue see the statement of William Ball, before the U.S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Hearings on Quality Education, October 19, 1983.
22. Quoted in *Background Material on the Family Choice Initiative*, Republican Caucus, California State Assembly, November 1979, p. viii-12.
23. Ibid.
24. Futrell testimony, Hearings on the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1983.
25. See the author's "The Reagan Administration and Education," *Human Events*, Feb. 26, 1983; and "Education: Do More or Do It Differently?", *Washington Times*, June 15, 1983.
26. U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, Hearings on the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1983, April 6, 1983, pp. 9-12.
27. Telephone conversation with Mr. Duffy, January, 1983.
28. *Washington Post*, Jan. 21, 1983.
29. In December of 1983 I asked a Catholic school principal in Washington whether he had ever heard of the proposal to turn Chapter One into a voucher system. The answer was "No."

I met with Mr. Duffy of the USCC staff in late January to learn more about his objections to the proposal. These objections seemed so patently unconvincing to me that I went home and wrote Mr. Duffy the following letter:

". . . Please have patience while I try once more to convince you.

"You say that you fear putting lower-income children into direct competition with handicapped children for the same program dollars. I agree that the original 1981 block-grant proposal would have had this effect, but the new voucher proposal would have just the opposite effect. By making the Title I structure radically different from the structure of P.L. 94-142, the voucher plan would make it harder than ever to consolidate the two programs into one."

"You say that the new structure might make courts more likely to outlaw Title I assistance to parochial schools on specious First Amendment grounds. But I would think that the voucher structure would tend to increase the percentage of participating children who are enrolled in *secular* private schools, and would therefore make it easier to satisfy the courts that Title I assistance to private-school children is non-religious in its primary purposes and effects. I would urge you to check with a friendly legal scholar like Jack Coons before making any hard-and-fast judgment about this aspect of the issue."

"You say that your advisory board tells you that the Title I program is equitable to Catholic schoolchildren as currently structured. I'm sure you've heard from more Catholic educators on this than I, but I want you to know that most of the ones I have consulted don't agree. One said that his students get fair treatment *only* because he's constantly fighting to get their share, and that he'd be delighted with a voucher mechanism which would deliver equal shares automatically."

"Unlike our secularist libertarian friends, you and I want *both* educational pluralism and extra help for the poor, both liberty and equality. I think Title I vouchers would promote both goals."

Mr. Duffy never responded.

30. See the author's "Where is the 'Merit' in New Merit-Pay Plans?", *Education Week*, Sept. 14, 1983.

Editor's note

The views of those opposed to the voucher program are well expressed in the following letter to Secretary Bell from Father Thomas Gallagher, Secretary of Education for the U.S. Catholic Conference. The letter is dated April 19th, 1983.

The Honorable Terrel Bell
Secretary for Education
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Let me begin by saying how grateful I am that you could take the time to be with us for the Congressional breakfast on April 7th. It was a very successful occasion from the reports that we have heard and I think the presence of people like yourself made it that.

As I told you at the breakfast, we have had the opportunity to review in detail a draft of legislation proposed by the Department of Education to provide state and local educational agencies the option of using funds from Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 for vouchers for economically and educationally disadvantaged children. We also had the opportunity to consult, about the proposal, with a broad representation of Catholic school leaders from areas where there are high percentages of our students participating in Chapter 1 programs.

As advocates for the free exercise of parental rights in education, we welcome the Department's openness and willingness to experiment with educational vouchers as a vehicle for providing parents, especially parents of poor and minority group children, with the opportunity to choose an education best suited for their children. Too often parents' rights in this area are merely rendered "lip service" while the opportunity to exercise such rights are scant. However, as I pointed out on April 7, while applauding the Department's consideration of a voucher option, we have some serious concerns about the practical effects of the proposal to voucherize Chapter 1.

The Catholic school community is particularly concerned about any plans to change the program authorized by Chapter 1. This program has been in operation for over 15 years, providing badly needed benefits to educationally deprived children in both public and private schools. Equitable benefits for children in private schools have been achieved only after many years of major efforts by private school representatives in school districts throughout the country. Today, there are significant Chapter 1 programs operating in every major metropolitan area of the nation, providing services to our students. We consider this program a successful one for both public and private school students.

Our assessment of the Department's voucher proposal raised numerous questions from many quarters which were not readily answered by a reading of the proposal, nor were some of them adequately answered during our early conversations with you and your staff. A sampling of these questions are listed below.

(1) What will be the criteria for determining which child receives a voucher? Would it be on the basis of an education need or would it be on the basis of an economic need?

(2) If the voucher can be used as tuition payments at a private school, what happens if the tuition is more than the amount of the voucher?

(3) Would this program be available to children already attending private schools or just to those presently enrolled in public schools? What criteria would be used in selecting parents to receive vouchers?

(4) If a student elects to use the voucher at either a public or private school outside his home district who would pay for the cost of transportation?

(5) If sufficient numbers of students within a school district elect to use Chapter 1 funds to attend private schools or public schools outside the district, conceivably this could exhaust that district's Chapter 1 funds. If such happens, how would students already attending public and private schools and in need of special educational services once provided by Chapter 1 receive them?

These are just a few of the many questions raised about the specifics of implementing the proposed Chapter 1 voucher which make us uneasy about its potential for success. We fear that voucherizing Chapter 1 could weaken a successful educational program which, since 1965, has provided needed services for poor and educationally disadvantaged children.

Until our uncertainty is dispelled we would have to withhold our support for the proposal to voucherize Chapter 1.

As an alternative to voucherizing Chapter 1, the Catholic school community may be receptive to an experimental program with new monies targeted to disadvantaged students attending secondary schools. Such a program would have the twofold effect of not jeopardizing the Chapter 1 program, which is focused primarily at the elementary level, and of providing the Department with a "showcase" for the exercise of parental rights and free choice in education for poor and minority groups at the secondary level.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment upon your Department's proposal, and in particular, for your attention and consideration of our suggestions in this letter.

Sincerely,

Rev. Thomas G. Gallagher
Secretary for Education

NINE

Issues in the Educational Progress of Black People

Benjamin H. Alexander
with
Preston M. Royster

> "Share a commitment to the American Dream and you know that both excellence and equal opportunity in education are essential to realizing our ideals and aspirations as Americans."
>
> T. H. Bell, Secretary of Education
> December 6, 1983
> Indianapolis, Indiana

Introduction

A discourse on educational issues which grew out of or is affected by racial attitudes, racial policies and racial practices is a very delicate and sensitive undertaking. This is true for several reasons: (1) practices that are racial often are not recognized as such and their impact and consequences are frequently not understood, (2) what is needed to correct previous policies and practices is commonly attacked on philosophical or political grounds as being either unfair or reverse discrimination, and (3) in some instances knowledgeable black people are reluctant or afraid to express views that stray from or do not appear to be a carbon copy of the views of "black leaders." Consequently, measures that appear to be good at their inception, but ones that would be more beneficial for black youths by being altered and improved, are left unchanged out of fear of being ridiculed. Moreover, if a white or moderate black person proposes a change in favored programs and practices intended to enhance educational experience for black youth, the reaction may be doubly explosive. As a result, full dialogue and analysis are shunned.

For example, let's look briefly at the concepts of *equal* and *fair* which are often not understood in educational practice. Consider the instance in which there are two recent high school students—one black and one white—who demonstrate equal abilities and potential. The black student has taken advanced mathematics including a course in calculus. The white student has a similar experience, except that he did not take an equivalent course in calculus. The black college instructor, in his attempt to be absolutely unbiased and equal in his treatment of these students, lectures to both in class but may refuse, even when requested, to provide extra assistance to either. The instructor perceives that he is carrying out the intent and spirit of equal and fair treatment. Clearly, the underprepared student needs some additional assistance to overcome his academic deficit which came from previous denial. To some people this instructor has obviously misunderstood and misapplied the intent of equity and fairness. The spirit of equal and fair to them embraces the concept of special help when needed. The instructor who did not provide the special help, rightly or wrongly, is often accused of being biased.

This chapter will aim at identifying and discussing some issues affecting the education of black people. The authors, who are themselves black, understand through many years of experience and involvement in education, that historically black people were not allowed to receive any education because of various practices. We recognize also that enormous progress by our people has been made in the past several decades. Nevertheless, as the developing needs of American society have mandated changes in the level and type of education that white students are expected to achieve, society must mandate the same changes and expectations for black students.

If we were to examine the pattern of attainment of educational progress by various white ethnic groups in the United States, it would be obvious that the children of poor whites (immigrant or otherwise) never have had the same educational opportunities as the children of middle and upper class whites. To a greater extent the problems facing black children today likewise stem from the fact that many of them are poor. However, we recognize that it was wrong in the past when America gave preferential educational treatment to more affluent whites,[1] and it is wrong today to give such treatment to any ethnic group.

As will be seen later, the educational progress of black people today continues to lag in part because of society's differential support of the affluent. In addition, the historical prejudices (which will be briefly described) have not been completely removed. Thus educational progress for black people requires elimination of racial prejudices and discrimination against the poor.

Stereotyping and Learning

The belief that people of any racial, social or economic level are inferior has a strong negative impact upon the educational attainment of that ethnic group. Just a few years ago, white members of the Washington, D.C. Board of Education received a book on educational matters from a well-known, now deceased southern U.S. Senator. The book was entitled, *Race and Reason, A Yankee View*, by Carleton Putnam.

One of our white friends on the Board gave a copy of the book to the black Board members to read. After reading it, there was no doubt in the minds of the minority Board members that the Senator's message to the white Board members was: don't do anything wasteful; you are not dealing with real people in the D.C. Public Schools (whose students are mostly black); you can't make folks like you and me out of those subhumans. The book cites tests and various other data picked up from many sources to try to prove that black people, as a group, have less brain-power than white people. This book by Putnam strongly supports the arguments of people who want to expound the thesis of black inferiority.

By providing some figures, some statistics, some percentages, and some names of tests and places and research projects, this book has enabled some anti-black people to out-talk others (sometimes by sheer loudness of voice) as they pour out Putnam's "facts and figures." This book presents in great detail and depth what many anti-black people want to read and believe.

There is another way to say that black people are educationally inferior—and that is to say it openly. A recent example of stereotyping, "The Intelligence Question/Are Black People Stupid?," is the title of a lengthy front-page article by Ms. Flora Johnson that appeared in a popular, widely read Chicago newspaper several years ago.[2]

Prior to discussing this article, which deals with the intellect, it should be made clear that development of the mind holds the greatest promise for the advancement of black people. If the mind is educationally undernourished, the person is underdeveloped. A lack of quality education for black people cannot be permitted.

Now to Ms. Johnson! She starts her article condescendingly by saying "Each of us knows black people who are not stupid . . . possibly even two or three." The message contained in the rest of the very long article indicates that the great majority of black people are stupid. The following are further quotations from this front-page article: "They say they are not stupid. The schools say they are . . . all black people score 12 to 15 points lower on IQ tests than all white people do. Even middle class black people."

According to Ms. Johnson, black people average 15 points lower on IQ scales than whites and are therefore inferior. The above is categorically untrue, as every learned person knows. Benjamin Alexander[3] spoke to this issue over fifteen years ago, and several times thereafter.[4,5] The facts are: the results of the testing of all soldiers in World

War II show that the average IQ of black soldiers from northern Ohio was higher than the average of white soldiers from eleven southern states. Moreover, the IQ average of black troops from the Boston area was higher than whites from many northern states and from all the southern and borderline southern states.[6]

Ms. Johnson's description of black people continues:

> The skinny men with their big asses, whose fashionable clothes are stained with grease. The tired women who move their legs as though they were shifting the trunks of trees. The kids in torn sneakers with radios three times the size of their brains. The young women whose stiff hair has been bleached to the color of copper, who can barely walk in their tight jeans and high heels, whose tight T-shirts are likely to say something mildly obscene . . . in one of Chicago's many all black schools, a child spends the days curled up in a fetal position, asleep on his desk . . . another child, 13 years old, has brought her baby daughter to class.

Ms. Johnson projects the image that black citizens may be not quite human beings. Oh, "two or three" of them are likeable, and you can become attached to these "two or three," just the same as you become attached to a faithful dog—you may even cry at its death—but black people just do not have good sense.

Where do such beliefs come from? Why do people write and speak so strongly about black people's intelligence in the face of the fact that many black employees are performing well in jobs that were performed only by whites until just a few years ago? The feeling that black Americans are inferior is not necessarily conveyed only by hostile white people. It is true that some of these appraisals even come from some black leaders, as well as white liberals who have distorted reality to many black people. Directly or indirectly they have persuaded too many black Americans that America owes them a living because they were previously slaves, and that they should do nothing until this nation gives them the 40 acres and a mule that were promised in the late nineteenth century. Some also state that it is totally unfair and racist toward black athletes to expect them to earn a score of 700 or better on SAT tests for entrance into college and to be able to participate in college athletics. Some of these same spokesmen are also strong advocates for teaching black children black English, with the claim that its use is in the best interest of black students.[7] Many of these same people are also strong supporters of forms of bilingual education that hinder the mastery of English by children whose primary language is not English.

The perceptions of blacks enunciated above do not reflect the present attitude of the majority of American people. However, the harm done is significant, because it influences public policy and practices even today.[8] Equally harmful is the damage to the self-confidence of the victims of these perceptions, those black people who are struggling against the obstacles of poverty and inferior educational opportunities.

Historical Educational Beginnings

In earlier days, by law and practice education was forbidden to black people. In later times, due to judicial and other pressures, separate and all-too-unequal educational opportunities became available in public education. Until very recent times the private sector (mainly composed of black people themselves) offered the best hope for insuring that black youth were removed from the rolls of the illiterate, especially in the south where the great majority of black people lived.

The educational experiences of black people in America are noteworthy. Black people are the only ethnic group which came to America speaking a language other than English and which was systematically and under the protection of law denied the opportunity to obtain an education. More basic than that, they were afforded no encouragement, support or opportunity even to learn to speak the English language properly.[9]

Discriminatory practices never appeared to be very rational. Neither did they seem to be implemented on a systematic basis. Nevertheless, educational experiences in sections of Virginia are illustrative of the difficulties and the slow progress made in many areas even after blacks were permitted to attend school.

Halifax County, which is situated in the south central part of the Commonwealth of Virginia, ranks fourth in area among all the counties in Virginia. It had a population of 41,365 in 1920 and 36,965 in 1970. In 1920 the population was 49% black and in 1970 40% black. The County started public education for white students in 1870, but elementary schools were not provided for black students until approximately 20 years later.[10]

Even when public elementary education was made available for black children, the public support consisted of meager salaries paid to the teachers; therefore, it was necessary that salaries be supplemented by the community in which the schools were located. The schools were usually built by community effort on donated land. Attendance at the schools was frequently poor because of the farming chores the children had to perform. Even though education was public, nearly all of the early public grammar schools were started by the self-help concept, which was not unique to Halifax County but permeated the south. Most schools originated under church sponsorship and survived because of individual initiative.

The schools were small and poorly equipped. They generally had one room and one teacher. In addition to teaching basics, the teacher looked after maintenance chores—supervising children, sweeping the floor and applying oil on the floor to keep the dust settled, and cutting wood or shoveling coal to keep the school warm.[11]

These early grammar schools were usually under the supervision of white board members who often were the very same citizens who under slavery had made it an offense against the law for slaves to be educated. Consequently, they gave a low priority to educating their former subjects.[12]

The conditions of and support of secondary schools were no better than for elementary schools. Secondary schools also had their beginnings through the efforts of the churches and a few dedicated individuals. There were at least two private black high schools in the County before 1900. As with the elementary schools, land was donated or permission was given to build on land that would revert to the owner when the school was no longer needed.[13]

The first of these high schools in Halifax County was the Antrim Church and Mission School, which was founded a decade after slavery ended, and was operated by the Antrim Parish of the Episcopal Church. It was the only such school for the newly freed slaves.[14]

The second of these schools was the Halifax Normal Institute, which was built and operated by the Banister Baptist Association from 1897 to 1920. Considering the financial sources of support and the level of sophistication of the Association members, the facilities were unusual, composed of several wooden buildings. One building was used for administration, another for industrial arts and other subjects, a third building for classes and a cafeteria and another as a dormitory for girls.[15]

This school was of special significance because it led directly to the establishment of the first public high school for black citizens in the County. In the early 1920s the old Halifax Institute buildings were purchased by the Halifax County School Board, to be operated as a public high school in much the same manner as it had operated as a private institution.[16]

Transportation for black students only came about in 1936, and then by using privately owned buses. It had been provided for white students beginning with the 1928-29 school year. The real irony of these circumstances was that the poorest, least educated and least self-sufficient group of citizens was provided the fewest of the services essential to their advancement. The black students had to pay room and board to attend the high school; moreover, their parents had to raise funds to help support the expansion of the school facilities, and they had also to find ways to support the provision of transportation for their children to the high school. The fact that most of the black children could not participate in the high school program seems rather evident. The County first initiated a public high school for black citizens approximately fifty years after public high school education was established for white citizens. For those who do not understand why such a large proportion of older black citizens are educationally deficient, this is a large part of the answer.

The above related to a rural southern county in Virginia. It is not unique. Fairfax County, now a suburban area of Washington, D.C., did not open its public high schools on an integrated basis until September 1954 or three months after the *Brown Decision* outlawed segregated education.

Poverty, Disadvantage and Achievement

For too long, the lack of progress of black children in education has been linked only to the previous years of neglect inflicted by white decision-makers. Too little, if any attention, has focused on individual and community efforts that must take place to catapult current and future generations of black and other minority children into well-educated, achieving and successful citizens. Past denial and abuse cannot be refuted—neither can the responsibility that both individuals and groups have to care for themselves. The tasks under consideration require mammoth sacrifice and strong self-will. Often parents have to forego immediate pleasure and gratification to afford a better future for their children. Likewise, children must be willing and strong enough to share their parents' vision by doing well in school so the sacrifices will not be in vain. Had more families and students understood this in the past—and confronted the problems at a personal level—many years of helplessness would have been averted. The time has long passed when black people in America can avoid or deny a portion of the responsibility for their educational status.

Today, unlike in the past, the performance of various ethnic groups is being identified. Test data, contrary to what some have said, show that some ethnic groups do better than others even though each has experienced some poverty and discrimination. For example, an interesting article based upon Department of Education studies shows that Asian students, many of whom earlier had language problems, rank number one over all other U.S. ethnic groups in class standing, admission to Ivy League colleges, academic honors, and doctoral degrees in science.[17] This outstanding showing of Asians contrasts with the statements of some black leaders (and white ultra-liberals as well) that black students are near the low end of the totem pole in education because they live in poverty and face severe discrimination. Were this the sole reason for low performance among black youth, Asian children likely would not have progressed so much higher than other minority children. For it is well-known that many of their families very recently came to America. Most of them were poor and handicapped with a language barrier as well.

Asian students have succeeded educationally over white, brown and black students in spite of racism and poverty, perhaps in good part because they generally obtain more parental encouragement, study harder, have strong self-images, respond more positively to discipline and work harder; therefore, racism and poverty cannot be accepted as the sole explanation for the educational level of some blacks.

Great black achievers of past generations,[18] such as Dr. George Washington Carver, Dr. Daniel Hale Williams, Dr. Mordecai Johnson, Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune, and Ms. Allice Allison Dunnigan,[19] who grew up without luxury and in the midst of severe racial problems, would agree. Outstanding black individuals of this generation such as Drs. Joe Henry, W. W. Sullivan, Kitty Robinson, Gladys Peterson, all born in modest circumstances and under similar racial barriers, would likely agree also.

By today's standards all of the above named black people probably would have considered themselves poor and disadvantaged, but unlike too many of today's black children, their parents failed to inform them that they were not supposed to excel and instead gave them strong encouragement and love and instilled in them a philosophy of excellence and self-discipline. These were black parents who said "no" when it would have been easier to say "yes," parents who demanded excellence at home and in family life as well as in the classroom. To these parents their children came first and this meant preparing them to survive and excel in America, and to grow up prepared for a world that was not always fair, humane or honest. They prepared their children, through strong discipline, for the real world that is tough, competitive, and often discriminatory and where academic excellence is prized and a lack of education is scorned.

On the other hand, too many black parents today seem to be sheltering their children from the real world, making life too easy for them, insisting upon special academic treatment for them, relaxing discipline, lowering academic standards in the schools and failing to insist that their children do their best. Actually, too many parents are failing to encourage their children to strive for an education, and the results are that many schools are graduating great numbers of students who are deficient in their ability to read, write and compute.

Reinforcement and motivation of black students by their elders is certainly a strong positive factor which can lead to greatly enhanced achievement. Thus, while recognizing historical obstacles and present educational system deficiencies, black people should not only identify what may be holding them back, they should strive to overcome these obstacles.

Far too often black students have heard that competency tests and particularly standardized tests are discriminatory against them. Let us assume that this is correct and that the tests are biased. Black students still have no choice but to prepare for these tests, take them, and pass them. No matter what some may say, competency tests do indicate what a person has learned up to a certain period of his education or life, i.e., after the sixth grade, twelfth grade, four years of college, or whatever.

Test scores that have been released in the past ten years show time and time again that black students generally score at the lower end when compared to their Asian counterparts. A good guess as to why black youths on a whole do not perform well on competency examinations is that they have not been properly taught to take standardized tests.

Teachers find that it is easy for black children to learn that $\frac{1}{6}$ plus $\frac{1}{8}$ equals $\frac{7}{24}$ or $\frac{5}{6}$ divided by $\frac{3}{8}$ equals $\frac{20}{9}$; that they can also recognize what is wrong with a picture showing a car with only three wheels or a tiger with only one eye. Therefore, if black students are taught properly, they will pass such tests; moreover, rather than opposing competency tests we suggest making sure that black youth are trained to pass them, whether the tests are biased or not biased.

It is odd that many black students who cannot pass these competency tests do so well in athletics. Why are black athletes so good in sports? Because they practice, practice and practice. When many Americans go to work in the morning they see black youngsters practicing basketball prior to school. On their way home from work, they see youngsters again practicing basketball, and many continue to practice from the time school lets out until dark. This is also true for the other sports in the appropriate season. Athletic-oriented students also practice many hours on Saturday and Sunday. They work hard at being good in basketball, baseball and football—and they are good; their hard work pays off. If they practiced their studies the same way, they would be equally good in English, math, science and computer operations, and they would be able to do better in competency and standardized tests.

Moreover, discipline is essential and strong in sports and there are no exceptions to the rules. The coaches, because of the "winning is everything" philosophy, will not give any kind of special treatment that consists of excusing inferior performance or overlooking poor behavior, and, most important of all, the athletes do not wish or expect special treatment.

Here again it is evident that achievement is possible despite the obstacles set up by others. To the motivation provided by parents, relatives and friends can be added self-motivation, with the realization that the goal is worthy of the chase.

Importance of the Academic Environment

A heartening report by Ogletree and Chambers[20] indicates that black students are more perceptive of the importance of their education than they are often credited to be. Further, they are sensitive to the necessity for their school environment to be seriously dedicated to instruction and not merely a way station for self-indulgence.

This study indicates that many children in the inner city are aware that earning an education is not all fun but a serious and demanding task and that their deliverance from the ghetto will come from education. Most of these students, surprisingly, know so well that nothing comes easy, nothing is promised to them and certainly only a little is given to them.

The report made by Olgetree and Chambers is based on a survey of inner city high school students in Chicago. Prior to the study, their educational colleagues guessed that the responses of the students would be the opposite of what they actually turned out to be in almost every instance. Some of the questions asked of the inner city students were as follows:

- Should students have freedom of speech in the classroom, i.e., should they be allowed to talk whenever they wish? *59% said NO.*
- Should students be allowed to use informal slang (street language) in the classroom? *71% said NO.*
- Should students have the right to argue with their teachers? *81% said NO.*
- Should students who continually disrupt class be expelled from school? *60% said YES.*
- Should students who use drugs and alcohol in school be expelled? *56% said YES.*
- Should students who sell drugs in school be expelled? *62% said YES.*
- Should the school have the right to establish a standard of hygiene? *66% said YES.*

Here is convincing evidence that disadvantaged students recognize that the answer to their dreams is in education. With perhaps little help or encouragement from parents or environment, these students have learned that an education is very precious. They have recognized that an educated person is more likely to succeed than an uneducated one, and that an education is vital if one wishes to advance.

The attainment of an education is normally an activity for children, adolescents and young adults prior to their entry into a profession or job. This fact should be kept in mind when pondering whether education is a leisure time activity or otherwise. For school age children, attending school is their principal activity just as work is for adults. In this sense, getting an education is children's work. For adults who are already in the work force, further educational attainment involves an additional burden, chore or hardship.

Even so, education is a necessary part of the American experience which should, therefore, be made as enjoyable as possible. At best, getting an education is difficult, it is demanding, it is essential and usually neither fun nor easy. Schooling, or getting educated, requires incentives, and clearly known benefits to motivate one to participate.

For black youngsters some of these ingredients have often been missing. Consequently, too many of them have not persisted in the pursuit of a good education. Following slavery and up to the late 1960s and 1970s, black citizens could look forward to opportunities in only a few professions—teaching, medicine, law, preaching, funeral directing and several others. Limited fruitful and profitable futures coupled with years of systematic and purposeful denial of education to black children have tended to discourage black youths from going into careers they dearly would like to pursue, and have made an otherwise laborious and grinding experience less desirable or tolerable.

In spite of all that has been said thus far, schooling can be made approachable and acceptable. One needs to know or feel reasonably sure that the rewards for hard work and sacrifice are waiting for those who persist. For black youngsters in particular, this is precisely what affirmative action efforts have done—they have opened entry to hundreds of very lucrative and prestigious opportunities that were closed prior to the late 1960s. Black youngsters previously did not pursue preparation for these fields but they realistically channeled their preparation toward what was attainable. Nowadays there is little if any excuse for not pursuing any of a large variety of occupational areas and attaining both satisfaction and great reward.

Educational experiences could be presented in a variety of ways to reduce boredom and make them more lively and enjoyable. This is nothing new, however, but more effort and experimentation could go into varying instruction more successfully.

To the extent possible instructional programs could be experience and interest related. For example, the mathematics program for elementary children who are interested in sports could include calculations dealing with facts related to football, basketball, etc. Again, this is not new but improvements are needed prior to any wide scale use of these techniques. A word of caution, however, is necessary. If care is not taken, efforts to make a subject fun could result in situations where the subject content is so diluted as to render the class meaningless.

The bottom line, however, is that we must face the fact that in general schooling or education is not mainly fun. It is tough; it can be draining and it requires hours of reading and analyzing. There is no way to avoid these activities. An additional fact is that no promise has been made that getting an education is or should be easy. It has always been exacting and frequently difficult, it will remain that way and that is the way it should be. One of the most important outcomes that the educational process is designed to produce is discipline—itself.

Every American should be able to read and write well. Educators do a disservice to students if they permit them to leave the grade school or high school ill-equipped to do so. Barbara Leslie Jordan made the point so beautifully in a speech, "Without reading ability, the greatest ideas ever thought, the most beautiful ideas ever expressed (or even the smartest), will be lost to that person forever. He will be intellectually crippled."

Reading is not just a problem to minority students, as many are aware. Basic communication skills are lacking throughout our society. It has become a sad fact, recognized by many, that college graduates, some with advanced degrees in business and the sciences, have such poor communication and enunciation skills that they cannot speak or even write simple correspondence or draft reports. Because of this, many corporations are requiring some of their employees to return to the classroom to learn basic reading, writing and communication skills as a prerequisite for advancement. Success in the competitive marketplace requires a command of the English language and the ability to read and communicate the written word.[21]

If the situation is bad for a white person who can't read well, it is worse for a black person. No matter what anyone says, if one cannot read, one will not succeed. Many black youths, today, live in an environment of fads and symbols such as handshakes, hair styles, slogans, disco music, and attitudes of passivity compounded by ghetto community pressure. Since they often respond to the influence of symbols and fads, maybe it is time that the society started selling reading to them as industry sells its products to them. For example, reading is like a Coke. Why do we say that? Because reading is "the real thing." Reading is like General Electric—"it lights your path." Moreover, reading is like a Hallmark Card—"it lets you be the very best." Reading is also like a Pepsi—"it's got a lot to give," and finally, reading is like a Slow-Poke Sucker—"it lasts a long, long time."

Reading is essential to becoming more productive and more responsible. One learns to read to be able to compete with articulate people. One needs to be able to read so that he or she will know the roots from which he or she came. If a person can read, travel will not be necessary to enable one to learn more about geography. Reading will give the knowledge of geography that will broaden one's scope and perspective about other people and other lands of the world. It is very important to the future of this country that we have a literate population.

A Need for Academic Improvement

When this nation was formed, its early leaders recognized the value of education, and over the years there has been a growing commitment to educational accessibility for ever increasing segments of its citizenry. John Adams once said, "I must carry a gun that my son may carry a plow that his son may carry a book." President James Madison said it another way, "Knowledge will always conquer ignorance."

For black Americans specifically, academic development should not be for its own sake. It should be for the enrichment of their lives, for expanded opportunity, for the sheer enjoyment of knowing how to distinguish between truth and error, good and evil, and between that which is first-rate and that which is second-rate.

All of us know that it is better for black children to be able to count and read, rather than not to be able to count and read, and that it is far better for black citizens to be literate than illiterate. A literate person is much better qualified to defend himself than is an illiterate one. The illiterate is much easier to exploit, to take advantage of, and to cheat. Uneducated black people have always received fewer of the benefits of our society and this will continue to be the case until their educational level is raised. It is for this reason that black Americans must strive toward academic improvement, and the setting of high academic standards.

Before World War II, the majority of lower income children received very little education. Going to school, particularly to college, was a luxury they could not long afford. Those few who did make it were very highly motivated; moreover, they were properly trained in the skills and tools of learning. When they were promoted from grade to grade in school, it really meant something. It meant that they had mastered the subject matter that was supposed to be covered in the school year. If they did not, they were held back and required to repeat the grade.

But since then changes have come about. The first change was a national commitment to education after World War II; America now provides wider and greater opportunities in education than it did before. Now there are a multitude of young people in educational institutions who just a generation ago would never have made it. That is a good change.

The other change—an undesirable one—was the introduction of "social promotion" to the nation's school systems because educators decided that it was wrong to hold children back. They contended that children should be kept with their age group, regardless of whether they had learned anything or not. So, large numbers of students were moved from one grade to the next higher level with serious deficiences. This whole atmosphere of permissiveness, although wrong, was probably created by people with very worthy motives. Too many teachers and professors felt a collective sense of guilt for the massive number of underprivileged students and their families. In other words, the teachers and professors were filled with compassion for these youngsters. They hated to give them failing grades but also found it much easier simply to pass them along rather than to be hassled, cajoled and threatened.

The result is that educators now find themselves confronted with the problems created because many of these students are not adequately prepared to do either high school or college work. No student should be passed from grade to grade who has not mastered specific subject content. A concerted effort should be made to provide the student with the tools and skills needed to pass reading, writing and arithmetic; however, if these efforts fail, he should not be passed to a higher grade, but should repeat the grade with additional assistance. Should he fail for a second time, he would be better off if placed in a specialized educational environment.

Today there are students wanting to enter college who are not properly prepared to do college work. Several alternatives are open to a university in such a situation. First of all, standards can be set so high that very few students can gain admission and succeed. On the other hand, current standards can be relaxed, or the practice of accepting students who made low grades through elementary and high school can be continued. Either of these alternatives deprives a majority of students of a good education or sends them out into the world unable to compete on equal terms.

Fortunately, there is a third choice which is realistic and should be carried out. A university should be relatively flexible in its admissions policies; only students with no possibility of successfully performing college work should be denied admission. Under this approach the university would not put too much stress on the students' high school performance. The concern should be placed on the student from entry until the time when the student is to graduate. For this reason, all entering students should take placement tests in the basic skills areas. Students should take these tests at the time of initial enrollment, not so they can be screened out, but so that any deficiencies can be identified. Students, faculty and administration should then work to eliminate the weaknesses so that the students will be able to carry on academic work at the university level. Those who are successful in maintaining the required grade level would also be required to pass competency examinations prior to graduation. Passing these competency examinations should ensure that the college graduates will be able to compete in the marketplace.

Common Sense Approach to the Basics

For at least ten years there have been discussions about returning to the basics in education. These discussions have grown out of the reality that too many of our youngsters in elementary and secondary schools have not been acquiring skills needed to perform well in college and to compete in a highly technical society. As America became more and more technically advanced, following World Wars I and II, curricula in our schools advanced rapidly to prepare youngsters for work in new electronic industries—television, radio, satellite transmission, transistor production, and eventually in the computer industry. The curricula in most schools became particularly rich with science, math and language following the launching of Sputnik by Russia.

The National Commission on Excellence in Education in 1983 pointed out that:

> Each generation of Americans has outstripped its parents in education, in literacy, and in economic attainment. For the first time in the history of our country, the educational skills of one generation will not surpass, will not equal; will not even approach, those of their parents.[22]

This sudden alarming decline in educational development has many causes. In many cases numerous "soft" courses were added to a school's offerings and students were allowed election of courses even to the exclusion of any basic requirements for advancement and graduation. As a result, many students elected easy courses such as "Being a good parent," sex education, etc., and a decreasing number took such courses as science, geometry, calculus, languages and history that expand their abilities and provide high level cognitive and analytical skills.

The Commission's report also indicated that:

> . . . these deficiencies come at a time when the demands for highly skilled workers in new fields is accelerating rapidly.

It further stated that:

> . . . the average graduate of our schools and colleges today is not as well-educated as the average graduate of 25 or 35 years ago, when a much smaller proportion of our population completed high school and college. The negative impact of this fact likewise cannot be overstated.[23]

Considering these circumstances, reform is clearly required. The educational decline now being perceived does not reflect just on the bright future leaders and inventors, but on the student body across the board. Therefore, solutions are needed that affect the entire range of students. Part of this reform includes recognizing that the schools cannot be responsible for all the needs of students. The public schools never should have been expected to teach such courses as parenting, birth control, drivers education and child rearing. Training in these areas lies in the domain of the parents and in some instances the church. Education reform requires, among other things, diminishing the importance of these courses and the establishment of a national curriculum which "should focus on the goal of creating a Learning Society."[24] The learning society provides opportunities for the individual to expand through exposure to sources such as libraries, the work place, galleries, and museums. Dr. Ernest Boyer, former Commissioner of Education, refers to this curriculum reform as a "core curriculum."[25] The basis of this national curriculum grows out of the need for all students to possess a set of uniform knowledge and curriculum skills. This uniform curriculum would qualify students for advanced training opportunities in various areas based on their individual interests.

The proposed national high school curriculum is very close to that suggested by both the National Commission on Excellence and the Carnegie Commission which includes as a minimum three or four years of mathematics, four years of English, four years of social studies and humanities, three years of science, foreign language, expository writing and computer science. Of course, it is essential that the elementary school curriculum contain courses that build a background for pursuing these courses at the secondary level.

Special attention needs to be given to the recommendation for including computer training in the curriculum. There are some potential dangers associated with computer training in the schools if care is not taken. First, it is suggested that training in computer science be considered as a basic skill. A distinction must be made between basic skill in computer science and the use of the computer as a teaching machine. Students should be free and encouraged to expand their skills and use of the computer in performing any number of class-related activities, but the teacher should not rely on the computer as the major source for imparting knowledge to students. The computer is no substitute for the teacher and the personal element that only the teacher can provide. Thus, students should be proficient in computer operations to perform numerous learning activities and as preparation for work which carries a high demand in the job market.

It was reported recently that more than half of the 53,000 Maryland ninth graders who took the statewide proficiency examination in writing in the spring of 1983 failed. One conclusion drawn was that increasing use of electronic media has reduced the quantity of writing, thus reducing the quality of writing. The ability to write legibly is no doubt also affected. Paul Williams, Director of Testing for Maryland, said in a Washington *Post* article that, "as the electronic media and telephone increase in pervasiveness, we are probably not writing as many letters or writing as much in general. It is possible therefore that writing skills may have atrophied."[26] Educators should be careful that an increase in computer usage does not produce a consequent disuse of writing skills.

A further look at the dangers reveals that poorer school districts lag far behind more affluent districts and create a great disparity between middle class and poor children regarding their knowledge and skills in computer usage. Craig Savoye in *The Christian Science Monitor* noted that:

> Educators and others are concerned that this discrepancy is widening the gap between the haves and have nots in American education, and further exacerbating racial and class stratification in the United States.[27]

It is frustrating to observe that, while traditional barriers to education have tumbled, the leading edge of opportunity continues to elude the poor and isolates them from many of the better job opportunities. One great concern rests with the fact that large numbers of black students fall in the poor category. "To the extent that computer literacy and computer expertise are necessary for success in getting and keeping jobs, computer inequity is a serious problem," warns Ronald E. Anderson, Associate Professor, University of Minnesota, in the same article.

Conditions for broadening the gap between the rich and poor are only too prevalent. Extreme care must be taken to reverse current practices. The Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, found these disheartening facts:

> Elementary schools with large minority enrollments and those with mostly white students use their microcomputers for vastly different reasons, says a new study on computers in the classroom. Even when both enroll mostly low-income students, predominantly minority schools use ***their microcomputers for remedial education,*** while predominantly white schools use theirs to help above-average students, said the study. Minority schools concentrate on providing drill and practice programs to low-achieving students, hoping to bring up their level of achievement. ***The white schools, on the other hand, believe that slow learners require the personal attention of a teacher.***[28]

Special attention also needs to be placed on the study of the English language. Many schools serve a large number of students who are not proficient in English usage. They consist mainly of two groups: (1) immigrants who speak little or no English, and (2) American citizens who have limited mastery of English (many in this latter group are black students). From these groups come the unskilled and unemployed. Consequently, the schools need to concentrate on making these students highly proficient in speaking and writing English. In America these two skills are the *sine qua non* for employment and advancement. Ernest Boyer states that in addition to speaking, students should "be required to take a writing course which we say is the most important and most neglected skill."[29]

The national or core curriculum should be the driving force behind setting and maintaining high standards in the schools. The success of this approach to curriculum development rests on constant evaluation of the students and the teachers, considering grades, growth and development. These measures are indicative of the quality of teaching provided in the classroom and may well be used as a basis for determining inservice training needs for teachers and deciding whether to retain or replace teachers and administrators.

Athletics Within the Educational System

While the purpose of elementary and secondary schools and of colleges is to educate students, there are many activities in a school which take place outside the classroom. Clearly the mind can be nourished by newspapers, drama societies, debating clubs, language groups, science clubs and the like. Similarly, both intramural and extramural sports are beneficial.

In recent years the argument has been propounded that athletic programs have made it possible for the poor, and especially for blacks, to have the opportunity to go to college and get an education. Unfortunately, the reality has not always (or perhaps even often) lived up to the promise.

The question of the relationship of athletics to education, or the priority that should be placed on one versus the other is now gaining a great deal of attention. One part of the answer is that too many people, including education leaders, have lost sight of the fact that the mission and purpose of schooling is to educate. The sad fact is that athletic participation is too often implemented in a way that works against and interrupts the education process. Until school officials and athletic interests find a satisfactory way to coexist in the schools (the education arena), the educational experiences of many participating students will be flawed. Any solution must give heavy priority to the academic program—no other resolution is acceptable. Dr. Norman C. Francis, President, Xavier University, pointed out in a press statement that, "Athletics is an important part of the development process—but it is secondary, not primary."[30]

Conflicts between the demands of athletics and the requirements of academic programs have been around for a good number of years. Generally, they permeate the entire educational system. There are, however, special concerns relative to black students. Public attention is now being focused on the exploitation of black "super athletes" who are energetically recruited and once enrolled, exploited and abused by being placed in academic programs that keep them eligible to participate in National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) sports but do not advance them toward skill development or graduation.

Even though this issue is normally related to college admission, eligibility and education, it really starts in the high schools with relaxed course requirements, low standards and a lack of guidance and encouragement in academic matters. Some high school coaches seem to have a "blind thirst" for winning (as their identification with success). Long, strenuous hours are required for practice and team participation. The lure for participating students and their parents is the luxurious life and stardom that come from a highly successful college athletic career and an eventual professional career.

The National Commission on Excellence in Education indicated that:

> . . secondary school curricula have been homogenized, diluted, and diffused to the point that they no longer have a central purpose. In effect we have a cafeteria-style curriculum in which the appetizers and desserts can easily be mistaken for the main course . . . Twenty-five percent of the credits earned by general track high school students are in physical and health education, work experience outside the school, remedial English and mathematics, and personal service and development courses, such as training for adulthood and marriage.[31]

While such a situation is unfortunate for a student body generally, far worse is the fact that the academic program for black high school athletes is often more homogenized and even less instructive. Any person in our current society who does not possess skills to obtain a productive job following high school, and who does not have any skills other than athletic prowess to gain admission to college, most likely will be in for many years of frustration, disappointment and failure.[32]

At the college level, there are numerous well-publicized instances of black "super athletes" who attain college stardom but never experience success following college either in the professional sports ranks or the general professions. In addition, numerous examples may be found of former college athletes who were given a full diet of a "strained," "watered down" curriculum only to maintain eligibility for athletes. Many of these students who were promoted through both high school and college only for the sake of eligibility (exploited), are then left to suffer humiliation, embarrassment and failure once their years of eligibility have ended. During 1982 and 1983 the national media gave wide coverage to one such black athlete who did not make the pros and could not even read. He has since enrolled with elementary and secondary students in Marva Collins' school in Chicago to learn elementary skills such as word attack and eventually reading.

At the 1983 Annual Meeting of the College Board it was stated that students in all programs must meet stiff academic challenges if they are to prepare for a rapidly changing society. Reacting to abuses and the exploitation of student athletes, the National Collegiate Athletic Association in 1982 adopted Proposition 48, which requires a 2.0 high school grade point average and a minimum score of 700 on the Scholastic Aptitude Test or a score of 15 on the American College Test for its entering student athletes. The announcement of this standard created a furor from some black education leaders who viewed it as a racially motivated attack on black student athletes and as an effort to exclude blacks from intercollegiate sports programs in which many of them surpassed their white teammates.

Considering the national recognition of the danger of educational mediocrity, the low national academic and technical skills, and the excessively high unemployment of blacks, it is hard to believe that some black educators hold that athletic skills should be developed without regard for academic skills, but that has happened under the present eligibility rules. The authors of this paper contend that standards of admission must be used and that the standards set by Rule 48 may be too low. This contention is supported, generally, by two outstanding educators, both of whom are black. Dr. Norman C. Francis of the Commission on Excellence and President of Xavier University, New Orleans, went even further into the issues and indicated in a press statement that too much discussion has centered around specific questions, such as the legitimacy of the S.A.T. What has not been thought out is the real problem, that is the failure of this nation's school system to properly educate all its youngsters. The major issue of providing an equal opportunity to quality education cuts across racial lines and is more directly related to economic levels than cultural or ethnic backgrounds.[33] Dr. Harry Edwards, Professor of Sociology, University of California at Berkeley, agrees and believes that, this situation, considered in combination with the athlete's educational underdevelopment, certainly helps explain why so many black athletes not only fail to achieve their expectations of life-long affluence but also frequently fall far short of the levels achieved by their non-athletic peers.

In addition to the generally weak curricula in schools across the nation and a special concern for the undereducation and abuse of black students, the exploitation and academic abuse of athletes ranks among our greatest educational concerns. Ironically, the historically black colleges, which have been the greatest resource available to black students, stand to lose in the economic battle to attract, educate and graduate black athletes. Nonetheless, these institutions must continue to provide a strong, balanced program for their student athletes as a matter of justice.

Somewhere along the way some people seem to have forgotten that schooling is about educating people and providing them with the social, technical and academic skills necessary to compete and succeed in life. Therefore, we would call upon those who are opposing Rule 48 to reverse themselves, to work for better academic preparation for athletes in high school and to support efforts to establish minimum standards for admission of athletes to college.

Another matter which is of equal importance relates to the experience of athletes while in college. Sports programs require many long hours, hard work and dedication by the athletes. The colleges receive many benefits from their teams—gate receipts, national and regional fame, alumni praise and increased endowments—among many other benefits. In return, the colleges must give the athletes whatever support they need so that their education is not neglected or overlooked. We believe the NCAA should strongly support the need for colleges to develop their athletes' minds while using their athletic bodies.

Allow us to paraphrase Dr. Harry Edwards, a well-known California educator on this matter; he feels the athletes and the school enter into a contract, i.e., athletic performance in exchange for an earned education. The athletes always keep their part of the contract whereas the colleges and universities rarely do.

Bilingual Education and Black English

People from practically every country in the world are immigrating to America. Obviously the great majority speak a language other than English.[34] The early immigrants adopted English and most learned it as quickly as they could. Also, most parents saw to it that their children learned standard English because of the opportunities that would open up to them. In many cases the children of the immigrants learned English exclusively, and did not retain their parents' mother language. Often this was to avoid being different from the majority of their English speaking friends.

America's policy, however, is not to destroy the native culture or language of its citizens. In this regard Shirley M. Hufstedler, former Secretary, U.S. Department of Education, commented during a meeting dealing with regulations for bilingual education programs that "cultural diversity is one of America's greatest strengths. We would not suppress it if we could; and we should not suppress it if we could. But unity is also America's strength." She went further, however, and insisted that "the ability of every citizen to communicate in our *National language* is the keystone of unity"[35] (emphasis added).

The notion of one common language for America is deeply embedded in America's political expression. President Theodore Roosevelt stated wisely that we have room for but one language, and that is the English language, for we intend to see that the crucible turns one people out as Americans. This implies of course that there is nothing wrong with Korean, French, Chinese, Japanese, Haitian, Spanish, Portuguese, and German Americans keeping their language, but not as a first language.

America has had numerous experiences in which it had to respond to attempts at bilingualism. It stood fast on each occasion. In the 1840s, 1860s and 1870s Congress voted down pleas to print government documents in German. Predominantly French-speaking Louisiana sought statehood in 1812 with French as its language, but opposition was great. In response, Louisiana included a constitutional provision that made English its official language. A century later, New Mexico sought statehood; its request was delayed, however, until after an influx of settlers from the north and east had made English, not Spanish, the majority tongue.

Today there is strong opposition to bilingualism and its divisive potential. Voters in San Francisco in November 1983, voted 62% in favor of Proposition 0, which called upon the city of San Francisco to encourage Congress and the Administration to print voting ballots only in English. This vote now enhances support for a constitutional amendment that was introduced by Senator Walter D. Huddleston to make English the official language of the United States.

Indications of potential divisions based on language differences are evident in several locations. For example, there is talk by militant Hispanics that California, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona were stolen from Mexico and must be returned. What are the implications when Hispanics become the majority in these states and Spanish is the language frequently spoken?

In south Florida, in several Spanish-speaking barrios, blacks and whites are denied jobs and other opportunities because they only speak English. Signs in the windows of many businesses indicate that "Only Spanish is spoken here."

Despite instances like these, English remains our national language and should be a unifying force which is crucial to the unity of the American government, business and educational systems.

Most education leaders, particularly in recent times, are placing a strong emphasis on restoring courses in foreign languages to the curricula in elementary and secondary schools, and in colleges and universities. The reasons for such encouragement should be carefully understood and followed. Studying a foreign language is not intended to enable Americans to communicate well with Americans. The unifying language, English, provides for that. It is, however, valuable so that people in this country will be able to understand and appreciate the cultures of people in other countries, their governments and policies, and so that American officials and citizens can relate and communicate better and more effectively with the government officials, leaders and citizens of other countries.

Bilingual education, unlike bilingualism, deals exclusively with the problem of teaching children whose primary language is not English in such a manner that they become proficient in English while learning other subject matter. "Formal schooling has a special obligation to help all students become skilled in the written and spoken use of English,"[36] according to Ernest L. Boyer, former U.S. Commissioner of Education and President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. This obligation is consistent with the Bilingual Education Act which states that the term, "Programs of bilingual education mean a program of instruction, designed for children of limited English proficiency in elementary or secondary schools, in which, with respect to the years of study to which such program is applicable—there is instruction given in, and study of, English, to the extent necessary to allow children to achieve competence in the English language. . . ."[37]

Relative to implementing these bilingual education principles, one should insist on two principles:

> First, each child must learn English and must learn it as quickly as possible. Second, while learning this language, children must not be allowed to fall behind their English-speaking classmates in other academic subjects.[38]

To implement the second principle, the implementing regulations permit instruction in "the native language of the child (to the extent necessary to allow children to achieve competence in the English language)."[39] An important aspect of the Bilingual Education Act is that instruction in the child's native language is discontinued once proficiency in English is attained.[40]

Another approach to teaching children whose primary language is not English is called teaching "English as a second language." In this method children's instructions are started and continued in English (no instruction is provided in the child's primary language). In fact, English as second language teachers may not be proficient in the language of the students. With this approach the student is likely to fall behind in other subjects while becoming proficient in English; this obviously constitutes a significant and harmful feature.

There are some guiding principles that must be adhered to when teaching children whose primary language is other than English. The teacher must respect both the culture and the language of the children and never abuse or "shame" the children for either, and the teacher must never knowingly or subtly discourage the children from maintaining either their native language or their culture. This is not to say that the school or the teacher has any responsibility for instructions or support in maintaining the students' language or culture. In fact, current Federal guidelines clearly are not designed to maintain either the language or the culture of any group.

Federal and state assistance programs must be carefully implemented to attain their intended goals and to avoid producing undesirable consequences such as dependency. Citizens should support the maintenance of their culture through community institutions of their choosing. There are several rich traditions in this regard. Jewish people, Asian Americans and Catholics whose youngsters attend public schools, send their children during evenings and weekends to institutions of their respective religions or ethnic background to receive training in their traditions. This is not the job of a school's bilingual education program.

The sixties ushered in the "do your own thing" attitude. This attitude has found its way into schools throughout America. It has produced situations in which black children have been allowed to attend classes when they want to, stay on the basketball courts as long as they wish, and in general pass through high school speaking broken English (often referred to as black English) and possessing very low skills in standard English. This "do your own thing" attitude has found its way into suburban schools, where many white students are also graduating without adequate skills to acquire good jobs. Now there is much talk about Spanish-speaking youths graduating from high schools without an adequate command of English to understand instructions and not equipped to hold responsible supervisory positions because they have not mastered enough English. Consequently, large numbers of these youths are unemployed. A perceptive response to this situation is provided by Herman Badillo, Deputy for Education in New York City, who is a Puerto Rican. He feels that "we have plenty of jobs in the skyscrapers of Midtown Manhattan. The problem is that the Hispanic kids can't spell."[41]

The answer is to stress English and other fundamentals in school. Our children cannot succeed without a good education. The former Secretary of Education said it well: "Today . . . the future for young people without (good) schooling is bleak and getting bleaker all the time. Education cannot guarantee a happy life or productive employment; but lack of education is very nearly a guarantee of lifelong poverty, dependence and despair."[42]

Before it is too late for the current generation of youths, it is hoped that parents and educators will realize that black English and other easy ways out, including forms of bilingual education that leave children crippled, are not the important issues for racial and ethnic groups. All racial and ethnic groups in America must learn and practice standard English so they will be able to compete with their most articulate competitors.

Since the authors of this chapter are black, their views on black English should provide some interesting insights on black English relative to education and to employment opportunities.

In this nation, academic advancement is not possible without first mastering standard English. In America the mastery of English is a part of progress. Therefore, few, if any, black students who wish to succeed in today's competitive world, who want a share of tomorrow's dream, and not just a glimpse of it, can expect success and satisfaction without speaking and writing standard English.

One should deal with the question of whether black English is a language. In our opinion it is not a language. Rather, it is a medium of communicating for a small number of people; moreover, its structure is not uniform, and it is not the major tongue of any racial or ethnic group. So, again, the best answer must be that it is not a language. A better description of black English is that it is an example of broken English used by some black citizens, who for whatever reason, have not learned to communicate well in standard English. For those who insist that it is a language, the question is, what practical use does it have? It does not allow for communication with individuals except for a very limited group of people. It hinders the movement of its users to the social circles of better educated standard English users, and to success in the business and professional world. In other words, it is a limiting detriment rather than one that opens doors to better training, education and careers. At best black English constitutes a personal preference with use limited to a few segments of community people in small, very personal and private settings; it is a form of communication used by a very small portion of society.

The recent court ruling by U.S. District Judge Charles W. Joiner in Ann Arbor, Michigan which calls for implicit recognition of black English presents cause for great concern.[43] It approves of children getting their education in a tongue that has limited acceptance in society, and consequently black English will certainly doom many of them to limited low level occupations. Further, and probably more seriously, the ruling seems to imply a belief that those school children are unable to learn the basic language of America. Judge Joiner's decision requires recognition of black English even though it has no uniform grammatical rules. He indicates that the teachers at the school, also, should be trained to teach black English to the students. Can they really be educated to do so? Or will they just pretend, resulting in the students suffering even more? All black American students have grown up with enough association or proximity to speakers of standard English that they can fully understand any instructions given in standard English. Consequently, all of their instructions should be in English.[44]

Because Judge Joiner has rendered his ruling, black English may be taught or utilized in the Ann Arbor schools. The affected students, however, should never be forced to abandon standard English; moreover, the students should receive careful and thorough explanations of why it is better to learn and practice standard English rather than black English in the school, the work place and in social and professional settings.

Success in the marketplace requires hard work. Everyone who has succeeded knows that and also that there are many obstacles in the way. Speaking non-standard English is one more unnecessary obstacle for black students. Thirty years ago black Americans were marching and demonstrating for the doors of education and opportunity to be opened equally for all; that goal has almost been realized. Let's not throw up new obstacles such as black English to complicate the problem and reduce opportunities that have been gained with great difficulty.

Affirmative Action and Motivation to Learn

Affirmative action, with respect to its appropriateness and effectiveness, is one of the most widely discussed civil rights issues at this time. Among the observations being made are these: (1) a few white Americans believe it leads to hiring or admitting unqualified persons, usually black, (2) some believe it leads to reverse discrimination, and (3) many claim that it has not been effective. The fact of the matter is that requiring organizations to hire or admit persons from among groups that have been historically excluded only partly helps balance a wrong that has been practiced throughout American history.

It is appropriate in this chapter to look at affirmative action in relation to its impact on learning. Access to good jobs directly influences the motivation that black or any other children have toward attaining a good education. If students can see and be reasonably assured that the diligent pursuit of education and the development of skills lead to good jobs with good pay which produces good living, they are more likely to stay in school and study hard. Conversely, if the harvest does not seem bountiful, they are more likely to drop out and less likely to be diligent.

Affirmative action activities in the education field itself obviously have an immediate and direct impact on black students and teachers. Therefore, we need to look rather closely at some of the employment practices in school systems and universities and at student admission programs in colleges and universities.

In addition to the constitutional principles of equal employment opportunity, there are sound educational principles for hiring and maintaining a balanced staff and faculty that reflect the racial and ethnic makeup of the student body of a given school. Among these principles are (1) reduction of racial tension, (2) an improved and retained understanding of the unique needs and concerns of the entire student body, (3) greater assurance of fairness in both treatment of the students and curriculum content and (4) role models which serve as motivating forces for students. A mixed faculty is desirable and beneficial even in schools where only one race is present. Stereotypes can be reduced, greater respect for racial and cultural differences can be promoted and cross cultural relationships can be enhanced.

There were many black educators in southern districts prior to school desegregation. Following desegregation, that situation changed drastically when massive dismissal, displacement and demotion of black principals and teachers took place. Dr. Benjamin Epstein of the National Association of Secondary School Principals stated that, "when schools are desegregated and must serve black and white students alike, the 'powers-that-be' who select the staff for these schools apparently try to make sure the white students will not be under the direct authority of a black principal." He stated that "there seems to be little or no compunction about having the situation in reverse . . ."[45] Several examples will suffice to show what happened to black principals:

> In South Carolina, the number of black high school principals was reduced from 144 to 33 between 1965 and 1970. Alabama in 1967 had approximately 250 black public school principals, but by 1970 the total had been reduced to 50—a drop of 80 percent. Perhaps most dramatic is what happened in North Carolina between 1963 and 1970. In 1963, black principals of high schools totaled 227; in 1970, there were only 8 black high school principals remaining—a drop of more than 96 percent.[46]

Dr. Albert Baxter, Associate Professor of Education at Arkansas AM&N College, documented the displacement of black teachers in 62 of the State's 382 districts during 1969, the year in which each district desegregated. "In most instances," said Dr. Baxter, "almost all black teachers were gotten rid of."[47] Intentional efforts to reverse the above conditions have been started and some black principals have been restored in southern districts.

In northern, south-western, mid-western and western states where schools were not segregated by state law, there were usually few, if any, black teachers and administrators. Arguably, it was affirmative action policies that brought equitable numbers of minority teachers and administrators to these districts and to state education offices, as well as recent increases in management level staff and teachers to non-southern schools. This also applies to colleges and universities, where there were hardly any minority presidents, deans, chairmen, staff, and teaching faculty except in the black colleges and universities. A few major universities and state higher education systems have been headed by black educators. In addition, there have been sizeable increases in the numbers of deans, department heads, chairmen, staff, teaching faculty and program directors during the same period of time.

Likewise, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of black students admitted to predominantly white institutions. Dr. Mary F. Barry, former Assistant Secretary of Education, noted that, "in 1978 of the 866,315 black students out of a total undergraduate student population of 8,513,310, seven in ten were enrolled in such institutions."[48] This increase in the mainly white institutions inevitably signified a sizeable, positive increase in the overall number of black youngsters pursuing higher education. The difficulty is that a disproportionately high percentage of black students who receive the baccalaureate degree still graduate from historically black institutions. Many other students are returning to black institutions because of admission and retention problems in white colleges.

There are numerous positive effects for those black students who graduate from mainly white schools. Many are able to gain training in fields that are not available at the historically black schools. In addition they become acquainted with and move into the referral system of big business and make contact with future business and corporate leaders and decision-makers, their white classmates. These are important and valuable gains which could lead to much higher levels of success than might have been otherwise anticipated.

Success of black students is notably higher in the most prestigious private and public white institutions which have the lowest attrition rates of the black students they enroll. Most often these prestigious schools recruit black students with high grade point averages and SAT scores which place them among the group of students least likely to fail in any case. The less prestigious colleges, which make up the largest number of predominantly white institutions, have high attrition rates because of less stringent selection criteria, as well as "lack of preparation and the absence of appropriate remediation, advising and counseling . . ."[49]

Among the myriad of affirmative action efforts around the country, certainly some failures can be found. This is also true for any endeavor, profession, occupation, or business venture. No doubt such programs will continue to generate controversy, particularly among those whose first thoughts include "incompetent blacks," "preferential treatment," and "reverse discrimination," when "affirmative" is mentioned. These programs are not perfect, but neither were the outrageous and systemic conditions that caused their creation. It was imperative that the situation of discrimination be corrected. It is to be hoped, however, that once the goals of fair and equal access to education and employment have been achieved, and our society has come to accept that goal that extraordinary compulsion will no longer be necessary.

Notes

1. Reverend Jesse Louis Jackson, *The State of Black America and The Challenge to Overcome Against The Odds*, printed by the Communications Department of Operation PUSH, Chicago, Illinois, January 31, 1983, p. 2-3.

2. Flora Johnson, "The Intelligence Question/Are Black People Stupid?" *Chicago Reader*, Vol. 9, No. 33, May 16, 1980, p. 1.

3. Report by Benjamin H. Alexander, Member, Washington, D.C. School Board, AFT Conference, *Racism In Education*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, May 25, 1968, at Benjamin Franklin Hall.

4. Response by Benjamin H. Alexander, President Chicago State University, to *Chicago Reader* article, "Are Black People Stupid?" Published in *Chicago Reader*, September 1980, pp. 2-4, 8.

5. Report by Benjamin H. Alexander, President, D.C. Federation of Civic Associations, at Mayor's Summer Youth Kick-Off Program, Banneker Stadium, Washington, D.C., June 17, 1972.

6. Ibid., p. 4-6.

7. Only one of over 250 national leaders—black, white and brown—who spoke out openly and forcefully against Black English (the great majority approved of the use of Black English) at the National Invita-

tional Symposium on Black English that was held at Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, February 21-23, 1980.

8. This is very evident in a recent court decision, which will be discussed later in the chapter, *Martin Luther King Junior Elementary School Children, et. al,* Plaintiffs *v. Ann Arbor School District Board,* Defendant. Civ. A. No. 7-71861, U.S. District Court, E.D. Michigan, S.D., July 12, 1979, on submission of Plan, August 24, 1979.

9. W.C. Edwards, Preston M. Royster and Lazarus Bates, *The History of the Education of Black Citizens in Halifax County: 1866-1969,* (Springfield, Va.: Banister Press, 1979), p. 12.

10. Ibid., p. 48.

11. Ibid., p. 42.

12. Ibid., p. 46.

13. Ibid., p. 27.

14. Reverend Wellington E. Webb, *Antrim Church and Mission School for Colored People,* December 1888. (A Report to the Antrim Parish of the Episcopal Church.)

15. W.C. Edwards, et al., *The History of the Education of Black Citizens in Halifax County,* p. 34.

16. Dedication Program of the Halifax-Pittsylvania County Community Center, September 10, 1978.

17. Joan Beck, "Asians Rise to Top of the Class", *Washington Post,* July 31, 1981; W.V. Grant and L.J. Eiden, *Digest of Education Statistics 1982,* National Center for Education Statistics, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983), pp. 70-71, 122-123.

18. Russell L. Adams, *Great Negroes Past and Present* (Chicago: Afro-American Publishing Company, 1963).

19. Allice Allison Dunnigan, *A Black Woman's Experience—From School House to White House* (Philadelphia: Dorrance and Company, 1974).

20. Earl J. Ogletree and Marie Chambers, *ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education,* Teachers College, Columbia University, May 1979, No. ED. 164-726: *Black Inner-City High School Students Surprisingly Conservative on Rights Question,* Phi Delta Kappan, April 1978, pp. 563-64.

21. Michael A. Olivas, *The Dilemma of Access* (Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1979), p. 180.

22. National Commission on Excellence In Education, *A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform,* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983), p. 11.

23. Ibid., p. 10.

24. Ibid., p. 13.

25. Ernest L. Boyer, *High School* (New York: Harper and Row, 1983), p. 302.

26. The *Washington Post,* November 30, 1983, p. A1.

27. *The Christian Science Monitor,* November 10, 1983, p. 24-26.

28. *Education Daily,* Washington, D.C., October 31, 1983, p. 1.

29. *Harrisburg Evening News,* November 5, 1983.

30. *The Atlantic Monthly*, August 1983, p. 33.
31. National Commission on Excellence In Education, *A Nation At Risk*, p. 18-19.
32. Personal communication from Mr. Frank Bolden, retired Director of the Department of Health, Physical Education, Athletics & Safety of the District of Columbia Public Schools, President of the Washington, D.C. Federation of Civic Associations, July 22, 1983; by Mr. Bolden "Proposal 48—Blight or Blessing" distributed within District of Columbia school system.
33. *Atlantic Monthly*, op. cit., p. 33.
34. Essay Against A Confusion of Tongues, *Time* Magazine, June 13, 1983, p. 30-31.
35. Shirley M. Hufstedler, a speech made at a hearing to consider proposals for school regulations, San Antonio, Texas, September 8, 1983, p. 9.
36. Ernest L. Boyer, *High School*, p. 302.
37. Public Law 95-561, Sec. 703(a), (4), (A)(1)—November 1, 1978.
38. Hufstedler, San Antonio speech, p. 8.
39. Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), CFR 500.4.
40. Ibid., p. 10.
41. Chicago *Times*, October 17, 1983, p. 22.
42. Hufstedler, San Antonio speech, p. 6.
43. *Martin Luther King Junior Elementary School Children, et. al*, Plaintiffs *v. Ann Arbor School District Board*, Defendant. Civ. A. No. 7-71861, U.S. District Court, E.D. Michigan, S.D., July 12, 1979, on submission of Plan, August 24, 1979.
44. Educational Excellence Network, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, October 1983, Vol. II, Number 10, p. 79.
45. Testimony given by Dr. Benjamin Epstein, Chairman, Status and Welfare Committee, National Association of Secondary School Principals, before the U.S. Senate, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, June 14, 1971.
46. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, *Displacement of Black Educators in Desegregating Public Schools* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972), p. 2-3.
47. Ibid., p. 4.
48. National Urban League, Inc., *The State of Black America 1983*, The National Urban League, 500 E. 62nd Street, New York, NY 10021.
49. Ibid., p. 302-303.

TEN

The Cradle and the Gap

Raymond S. Moore

We have not heard very much lately about the hand that rocks the cradle. We seem to doubt that it still rules the world. Instead, an aggressive state and its passive citizens are combining to insure that the "world" rules the hand that rocks the cradle. This reversal of roles has also turned around the high levels of literacy and moral behavior which characterized early America. It will be hard to believe, but for over a hundred years—ever since we started public education—our nation has been declining in literacy, and in the process has gradually widened the gap between children and adults. It is no coincidence that in terms of her resources, America today has an abysmally low education product compared with other nations, and also has perhaps the least amount of family involvement in education. It is a record of history that when the state takes over the family, democracy dies. No wonder that President Reagan's Commission on Excellence declared that "If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war." Yet the public schools are no more to be blamed than the universities who train the teachers, the media which entertains, and derelict parents who do not know or care.

Even our poets have pointed us to lessons of history as a basis for future plans. Ralph Waldo Emerson wisely observed that "The years teach much which the days never know." If there is any lesson that history teaches clearly it is that there is no faster way to break down a nation than to break up its homes. And this never happens more quickly than when the erosion begins within.

Researchers and scholars like Harvard's Carle Zimmerman,[1] and J. D. Unwin[2] look beyond mere generation gaps to the possibility that we may lose our sense of family altogether. Already since World War II the "gap" has been powerfully and sadly felt by those who became the lost generation of the 60's and 70's.

The youngsters of those generations are now mature with homes of their own. Yet I observe a difference from generations past. These new families have less interest in caring for their older folks. They prefer the availability of Medicare, retirement centers and "rest" homes. The historic ethic of strong familism—each family caring for its own from birth to death—has surrendered to the narcissistic philosophy of letting somebody else do the caring. That "somebody else" may be the state or the county or Social Security or if fortunate, a pension.

The pitiful and bitter personal gap is still growing.

How does this happen? I contend that it starts with the surrender of a child from his earliest years to the institutions of the state or to alternative institutions. You who linger long with your children will find that they will linger long with you. On the other hand, the earlier you institutionalize your children, the earlier they will institutionalize you.

Yet, our society has become convinced that nursery school is a status symbol, and family life has surrendered to convention dictated by narcissistic philosophies and psychologists who either know or care little about children or who are on a devious mission to destroy our nation. And this is neither paranoia nor alarmism. Our educators and our psychologists have in fact brainwashed us into the assurance that they can outparent us.

Cornell's Urie Bronfenbrenner found that at least until the fifth or sixth grade, the child who is more with his peers than his parents will probably become peer-dependent.[3] Until at least age 11 or 12 he is highly vulnerable to the "social contagion"—habits, manners, finger signs, obscenities, rivalry, ridicule, and so on—rampant today. Even if his parents are still shockable, he does not fully understand the furrowed brow nor care about the remonstrances placed before him in love. All he knows is that when everybody is doing it, he is to do it, because his peers say so. He gives parental values the back of his young, inexperienced hand. This social cancer of peer dependency usually lasts for a lifetime. And to the extent that he becomes peer dependent, the child develops in time a miserable view of himself, his future, his parents, and even of his peers. All because he has been pushed out of the home nest and institutionalized too soon! This child, once very normal, now finds that he has little self-esteem or self-direction and, in a creative sense, offers little promise as a productive and patriotic citizen. Eventually he will grow up to have even less use for his parents than they had for their parents.

Many ask if we can reverse this trend. I believe that there is still some hope.

From ancient times through the early centuries of our country's history, the period of early puberty was considered the proper time to go to school. Age 12 or 13 was understood to be the time when a child's values were fairly stabilized and he could assume responsibility for his acts. The Jews called this bar mitzvah. The research of famed Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget centuries later agreed. "Cognitive" readiness, he called it—the age at which children in general are able to reason consistently from cause to effect.[4]

Many psychologists and psychiatrists, such as the late great J. T. Fisher, have proved that a child going to school at 12 or 13, now called adolescence, can quickly catch up and pass children who with anxiety and frustration have gone to school too early.[5] Dr. Fisher started school at 13 and graduated from high school at 16. He thought that he was pretty smart until experience taught him that any "normal child" can do it.

More than a half million parents, disturbed at school trends, have decided to educate their own children at home, utilizing simple, readily-available curricula. Some are physicians, attorneys, even school administrators. One is a presiding superior court jurist in a major American city. There are many who do not have a college education. Nevertheless nearly all their children excel in achievement, behavior and social ability. The child who feels needed, wanted and depended upon at home, who senses that he is part of the family "corporation" is the one who has self-worth. And self-worth is the key to a positive sociability.

Frank Vandiver, formerly head of Rice University and at this writing, President of Texas A & M, quit school at grade seven, skipped junior high, senior high and college to enter the University of Texas by examination at the master's level. There are others who are following in his footsteps nowadays. Grant Colfax was left free to raise pedigreed family goats until he was fifteen, when his mother began to formalize his education at home. Although neither mother nor father had scientific leanings, Grant recently enrolled in Harvard's biology program on a full scholarship via examination. Nor is this unusual. University of California, Berkeley, accepts a few home schoolers each year. Incidentally, history still repeats itself. For the last thirteen of his eighteen years, the Colfax home, like that of home-schooled John Quincy Adams or Abe Lincoln or Tom Edison, was without electricity, far away in the "boonies" of Boonville, California. Grant's younger brother, Drew, is following in his footsteps except that he was not so much influenced by the family goats as by the stars overhead. So at age fifteen he produced his first 12″ refracting telescope and is well on his way to becoming an astrophysicist.

But protests come from hard-shelled psychologists and educators that the boys obviously issued from genius stock. And that may be right. It is also right that home schools across the country, in general, significantly outrank the institutions as measured by national norms regardless of the level of education of the parents. But in the case of the Colfax's the answer is even more specific. David and

Mickey Colfax just happen to have adopted two younger sons, neither of them genetically related to the Colfax line. They are Reed, 13, who is Black, and Garth, 9, who is an Eskimo. These youngsters are showing the same qualities of genius as demonstrated by the Colfax's blood sons.

The reasons for this are really not that complex. Our principal educational channels are, of course, books. But more important for a young child's creative, productive learning, are the singular adult example, undiluted by too many peers, the freedom to explore widely, uninhibited by the cloisters of a typical classroom and the number of adult-to-child responses per day.

Some educators might argue that schools excel in item one, except that they forget that, as with the Colfax's, the public library—a gift of home-schooled Andrew Carnegie—is available for all children. In any event books are not as crucial to basic education as are the other three.

The importance of the undiluted *adult example* is vastly underestimated these days as we educators have set out to scratch the ability of parents to parent their own. The Bronfenbrenner studies at Cornell make this point clearly. Albert Bandura's work at Stanford, to mention only one of many studies, clearly shows that peer dependency is pervasive at the preschool level.[6] No wonder that in ancient times and through the first two centuries of American life most children did not start regular school until around 12 or 13. Even at those ages they went to school only three months out of the year until the Civil War and worked even then at least a half a day at home—in a neat physical balance for their mental efforts. Interestingly enough, that kind of education brought American estimated literacy rates of around 98 or 99% from colonial days to the Civil War.[7]

Free exploration is commonly known by developmental psychologists to be among the most effective of all educators. The birds and the bugs, the trees with their leaves, the stars and the fish and beasts all make sense and provide a great deal of information to the young child. He learns colors and textures, and sights and smells and tastes, and places them all in proper context uninhibited by the categorical influences of the classroom and its confining limits to learning. Cartoonist Tom Armstrong's character, "Marvin," described early-care institutions as "penitentiaries." But this is not funny for most children, particularly the very bright whose creative minds try to stretch beyond the school walls but who are forced in their anguish to let creativity die.

The fourth factor, *numbers of responses*, along with the quality of those responses, may be the most powerful educational factor of all. The average child in the average schoolroom today will receive from one to four or five personal responses from his teacher during the school day depending on how aggressive he is. Dean John Goodlad of the University of California at Los Angeles reported in 1983 on his study of 1,016 classrooms across the nation that the average teacher provided person-to-person responses to his students for an aggregate of seven minutes per day.[8] In contrast, a reasonably warm, responsive home or family school will supply 50 to 100 times as many responses as the average classroom. The quality of those responses often demonstrates a partiality which the child needs, and which parents are allowed, but from which classroom teachers are prohibited.

Public education as we know it today was a post-Civil War fact in which avant-garde educators of those days—such as Horace Mann and Samuel Coombs—set out to build an educational hierarchy which placed emphasis on personality, with a deemphasis on character development. Eventually the modern "I'm okay, you're okay" values of the narcissist became the way of our day with their full complement of amusements, sports and almost anything but productive work and self control. At the same time all of this positive thinking without experience in positive and creative doing has brought us down to a shocking literacy level. The University of Texas adult studies published in 1983 tell us that 20% of Americans have no survival literacy ability at all.[9] They cannot sign a check, make out an application for a driver's license or a job or do even the most minimal of necessities in terms of reading and writing and figuring. Another 30% have doubtful survival skills and only 50% of Americans today have these skills for sure.

On December 29, 1940 Walter Lippmann, the well-known pundit, delivered an address under the auspices of Phi Beta Kappa before the American Association for the Advancement of Science in the Irving Auditorium at the University of Pennsylvania.[10] Those credentials are about as sterling as you can find. What did he say? He looked back to the turn of the century:

> I venture to submit to you . . .
>
> that during the past 40 to 50 years those who are responsible for education have progressively removed from the curriculum of studies the Western culture which produced the modern democratic state;
>
> that the schools and colleges have, therefore, been sending out into the world men who no longer understand the creative principle of the society in which they must live;
>
> that, deprived of their cultural tradition, the newly educated Western men no longer possess in the form and substance of their own minds and spirits, the ideas, the premises, the rationale, the logic, the method, the values, or the deposited wisdom which are the genius of the development of Western civilization;
>
> that the prevailing education is destined, if it continues, to destroy Western civilization and is in fact destroying it;
>
> that our civilization cannot effectively be maintained where it still flourishes or be restored where it has been crushed without the revival of central, continuous, and perennial culture of the Western world;
>
> and that, therefore, what is now required in the modern educational system is not the expansion of its facilities or the specific reform of its curriculum and administration but a thorough reconsideration of its underlying assumptions and of its purposes.

Lippmann went on to concede that he was making "a sweeping indictment of modern education." But he defended his indictment firmly. He pointed out that the modern public school was not giving us what Thomas Jefferson had hoped. "As a matter of fact," Lippmann declared,

> During the 20th Century the generations trained in these schools have either abandoned their liberties or they have not known, until the last desperate moment, how to defend them. The schools were to make men free. They have been in operation for some 60 or 70 years (as of 1940) and what was expected of them they have not done. The plain fact is that the graduates of modern schools are the actors of the catastrophe which has befallen our civilization. Those who are responsible for modern education—for its controlling philosophy—are answerable for the results.
>
> They have determined the formation of the mind and education of modern men. As the tragic events unfold they cannot evade their responsibility by talking about the crimes and follies of politicians, businessmen, labor leaders, lawyers, editors and generals. They have conducted the schools and colleges and they have educated the politicians, businessmen, labor leaders, lawyers, editors and generals. What is more they have educated the educators.

Lippmann moved on to describe how *these schools have effectively destroyed the image of historic America and its democratic ideals "by separating education from the classical religious tradition. The school cannot train the pupil to look upon himself as an inviolable person because he is made in the image of God."* Lippmann concluded that "education founded on the secular image of man must destroy knowledge itself."

In order to emasculate American education, American educators have built up an aura of sacredness around the public schools until we have become more reverent of them than we have of motherhood itself and far more than we have of our God. But this has not satisfied these elite minds. In order to carry on their destruction they have had to fly in the face of principles they themselves have claimed to establish, for instance the inviolability of replicable research. Reliable research does indeed tell truth, but these people cannot bear with truth. So they ignore research. For example, *there is no replicable research whatsoever that suggests that normal children should be rushed earlier into school.* Even some of the great "progressive educators" like John Dewey and Angelo Rossi admonished American educators before the turn of the century by warning that little children should not be entered into school before 8.[11] Modern research not only verifies this, but also suggests that the really old-fashioned education from the ancient Jews is much more defensible. The Jews began schooling at about 13.

And of course we have the "great society" idea of school consolidation. This notion was the gift of the noted Harvard president, James Bryant Conant. But before he died, he came to realize that he was shooting from the hip. The great educational centers that he conceived for mass education had even before his death become educational ghettoes with vast educational smorgasbords in which neither teachers nor students could agree on what is best to take. Such top-of-the-head, seat-of-the-pants innovation has pushed research aside. Innovation—something novel—has become the theme of American education; change for change's sake has replaced true creativity in the schools.

Whether a person looks to the developmental research of vision, hearing and the other senses of the child, or the many studies on the brain, or Jean Piaget's often replicated research on cognition, you must come to the conclusion that the best nest for little children is the home until at least 8 to 10 or 12. University of Chicago's well-known perception psychologist, Joseph Wepman concluded years ago that if we could wait until at least 8 to 10 to place our children in formal education we could reduce the reading failure rate in our country to 2%.[12] And his University of Chicago colleague, Benjamin Bloom, who fought Wepman's ideas for years and who fathered much of the early schooling movement, finally was forced to similar conclusions as Wepman's when in 1980 he published his thesis that the home was the best educational nest afterall, parents the best educators and that parents were in fact educable.[13]

Yet all of these well established facts and revised conclusions are given little thought by such vested interests as the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers who repeatedly have expressed far greater concern for teachers' jobs than they have for the welfare of the young child. Gerald Koch, a vocal teachers' spokesman, while Chairman of the Unicameral Legislature's Education Committee for the State of Nebraska, stated in private conversation with the author that the reason behind having children begin school at age 3 or 4 was so that teaching jobs would be created by the change.

There are a few brave souls around who are willing to face up to social pressure and conventional wisdom and practice. Dr. John Bowlby, the London psychiatrist who heads the World Health Organization program on Early Childhood Development, insists that a relatively ineffective home is still often better for the child than a reasonably good school.[14] Dr. Martin Engel, then the Director of the nation's National Day Care Demonstration Project in Washington, D.C., pointed out:

> The motive to rid ourselves of our children, even if it is partial, is transmitted more vividly to the child than all our rationalizations about how good it is for that child to have good interpersonal peer group activities, a good learning experience, a good foundation for school, life, etc., etc. And even the best, most humane and personalized day-care environment cannot compensate for the feeling of rejection which the young child unconsciously senses.[15]

The facts are that we are creating learning disability in our country and in pushing our little children into school too early we are not only making them frustrated and anxiety ridden with respect to their studies, but we are also making them delinquent, for the Department of Health Education and Welfare statistics on learning disability and delinquency go implicitly together. And this isn't all.

For more than 40 years some of us have been concerned that most children are surrendered by homes to institutional life before they are ready—with serious implications for the children, the family, society, nation and world, including economical and moral disaster. In the late 1960s following a stint at the U.S. Office of Education, I became convinced that our children were victims of dangerous trends toward earlier schooling. We had reasons to be skeptical of school claims for early academic achievement and socialization simply because "young children learn so fast." By giving our schools "green grain" for their mills, we make their task impossible. Although challenging conventional wisdom and practice was not a pleasant prospect, colleagues around the world have more and more given support to our research, some reversing historic positions to do so.

Our conclusions are actually quite old-fashioned. They seem new to some because they differ largely from, and often challenge, conventional practice. Our early childhood research grew out of experiences in the classroom with children who were misbehaving or not learning because they were not ready for formal schooling. Concerned first with academic achievement, we set out to determine the best ages for school entrance. But more important has been the socialization of young children—which also involves senses, coordination, brain development, reason, and social-emotional aspects of child development. These conclusions come from our Stanford, University of Colorado Medical School, Michigan State and Hewitt investigative teams who did basic research, and also analyzed more than 8,000 early childhood studies. We offer briefly here our conclusions which you can check against any sound research that you know.[16]

Readiness For Learning. Despite early excitement for school, many, if not most, early entrants (ages 4, 5, 6, etc.) are tired of school before they are out of the third or fourth grades—at about the ages and levels we found that they should be starting. Tufts University Psychologist David Elkind calls these pressured youngsters "intellectually burned out."[17] They are far better off wherever possible waiting until ages 8 to 10 to start formal studies (at home or school)—in the second, third, fourth or fifth grade. They then quickly pass early entrants in learning, behavior and sociability. Their vision, hearing and other senses are not ready for continuing formal programs of learning until at least age 8 or 9. When earlier care is absolutely necessary, it should be informal, warm and responsive like a good home, with a low adult-to-child ratio.

The eyes of most children are permanently damaged before age 12. Neither the maturity of their delicate central nervous systems nor the "balancing" of the hemispheres of their brains, nor yet the insulation of their nerve pathways provide a basis for thoughtful learning before 8 or 9. The integration of these maturity levels (IML) comes for most between 8 and 10. It is not fair to test children for formal learning before at least age 10.[18]

This coincides with the well-established findings of Jean Piaget and others that children cannot handle cause-and-effect reasoning in any consistent way before late 7's to middle 11's. And the bright child is no exception. So the 5's and 6's are subjected to dull rote learning which requires little thought, tires, frustrates and ruins motivation, stimulates few "hows" and "whys." Net results: frequent learning failure, delinquency. For example, little boys trail little girls about a year in maturity, yet are under the same school entrance laws. Research is clear that boys are 3 or 4 to 1 more often learning disabled, 3 or 4 to 1 delinquent, and 9 to 1 acutely hyperactive.[19] So, unknowing teachers far more often tag little boys as "naughty" or "dumb." And the labels frequently follow them through school.

Socialization. We later became convinced that little children are not only better taught at home than at school, but also better socialized by parental example and sharing than by other little children. This idea was fed by many researchers from Tufts, Cornell, Stanford and California, including Urie Bronfenbrenner and Albert Bandura.[20] Contrary to common beliefs, little children are not best socialized by other kids; the more persons around them, the fewer meaningful contacts. We found that socialization is not neutral. It tends to be either positive or negative.

(1) Positive or altruistic and principled sociability is firmly linked with the family—with the quantity and quality of self-worth. This is in turn dependent largely on the track of values and experience provided by the family at least until the child can reason consistently. In other words, the

child who works and eats and plays and has his rest and is read to daily, more with his parents than with his peers, senses that he is part of the family corporation—needed, wanted, depended upon. He is the one who has a sense of self-worth. And when he does enter school, preferably not before 8 to 10, he usually becomes a social leader. He knows where he is going, is independent in values and skills. He largely avoids the dismal pitfalls and social cancer of peer dependency. He is the productive, self-directed, citizen our nation badly needs.

Negative, me-first sociability is born from more peer group association and fewer meaningful parental contacts and responsibility experiences in the home during the first 8 to 12 years. The early peer influence generally brings an indifference to family values which defy parents' correction. The child does not yet consistently understand the "why" of parental demands when his peers replace his parents as his models because he is with them more. Research shows that such peer dependency brings loss of self-worth, optimism, respect for parents and trust in peers. What does the child have left to lose? So he does what comes naturally: He adapts to the ways of his agemates because "everybody's doing it." And . . . he has few sound values to pass on to the next generation.

So home, wherever possible, is by far the best nest until at least 8 to 10. In a reasonably warm home, adult-child responses, which are the master key to education, will be 50 to 100 times more than the average teacher-child responses in the classroom. Where there is any reasonable doubt about the influence of schools on our children (morality, ridicule, rivalry, denial of religious values, etc.) home schools are usually a highly desirable alternative. Some 35 states permit them by law under various conditions. Other states permit them through court decisions. Home schools nearly always excel regular schools in achievement. Although most of them don't know it, parents are the best teachers for most children at least through ages 10 or 12.

In 1983 I was asked to recommend therapies for American Education to the Texas Governor's Select Committee on Education, chaired by Mr. Ross Perot and the Washington Governor's Citizens Commission on Education, chaired by Mr. Fred Haley. Here are a few suggestions to offset many of the myths of modern education and to give our children and our nation a chance to become the world's leading productive free enterprise system again.

—*History* has much to teach 20th Century Americans about education. Patrick Henry is but one voice which testifies to its importance when he said, "I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience."

—*Research* is replete with directions for our families and schools. We speak of ***replicable*** research which offers truth rather than the vested presumptions of studies that are not replicable. And we must bring that research actively into the planning, legislation and execution of education. This we are not doing as Americans and leaders, examples, to the western world. Evidence of this is that many, if not all, of the recommendations below (see starred items in particular) are supported by research, yet are either ignored or denied generally in our schools.

—*Common Sense.* If the record of history and/or of research and experimentation clearly shows that an idea is plausible or has worked, and there is no systematic, replicable evidence to the contrary, common sense says, "Try it," and courage sees that we try it regardless of human traditions, social pressures and jurisdictions. The following recommendations are made to local, state and national bodies with the assumption that common sense still can reign.

1. Inquire of the kind of education which prevailed when our nation was at a higher level of literacy and creativity, when American youth turned from crime.

2. Insist upon sound research evidence which crosses the various disciplines before making any and all policy decisions (as, for example, in early schooling laws where

research in vision, hearing and other senses, in cognition, in neurophysiology, in motor coordination and in socialization and behavior clearly contradict recent legislative trends).

*3. Provide a greater flexibility in school entrance laws in order to

a. Express awareness of wide disparity (at least four to five years) in readiness for formal schooling.
b. Insure boys the same readiness opportunities as girls.
c. Guarantee parents their constitutional rights (as interpreted by the U.S. Supreme Court over the past 60 years) to determine the education of their children.
d. Affirm and define the state's limited compelling interests to insure minimal skills, health and safety and education for citizenship, including both school and social welfare officials.

*4. Place larger emphasis on education of parents and less on institutionalizing children, including an aura of approval, on those parents who choose to work at home.

5. Welcome as satellites to school systems (public and parochial) those concerned parents who prefer to systematically teach their children at home.

6. Be less defensive about home schools in view of their high record in studies comparing them with national norms, i.e., other schools.

7. Apply truancy laws only to parents who are in fact truant or negligent in the care of their children.

*8. Reevaluate certification/accreditation policies for general education (K-12), on the basis of fact, in view of the lack of replicated research which supports such practices.

*9. Study to desegregate by age

a. By developing small schools.
b. By developing ungraded programs.
c. By encouraging home education.
d. By encouraging any method that brings children in larger contact and companionship with youn-

ger and older persons in order that they may be comfortable with all ages, more responsible in their behavior and less vulnerable to peer dependency.

*10. Move away from consolidation, busing, etc. toward smaller, more manageable, more personal neighborhood or rural schools—as much as possible like a warm, responsive family.

*11. Remove policy approval of, and educate away from, demands for rote homework; and encourage supervised study in the classroom—and more creative homework, if any at all.

*12. Balance academic studies with *at least equivalents of practical arts and manual skills*—which bring significantly higher academic performance than all-day academic classes. Insure that teachers share manual work.

*13. Simplify curricula, viewing education more as an active, exploratory, inspirational, responsive, experimental process and less as a formal didactic one, yet maintaining sound controls through high motivation. (This is essentially the recipe for development of genius.)

*14. View discipline as the fine art of discipleship making it clear that sound followership precedes sound leadership.

*15. Utilize cross-age teaching far more prominently, realizing that students are often more facile teachers than the classroom heads.

*16. Minimize focus of child eyes on television, computers and other close-in vision, for this insures myopia and myopia is a leading cause of blindness.

17. Insist on maximizing free exploration for all children.

*18. Place major emphases on teacher responsiveness to individual pupils, a preeminent source of genius. This kind of responsiveness is done so well in the home, whereas the average teacher today spends about seven minutes daily in such responses.

*19. Put away the myth that a positive sociability derives more from association with little children (and their peer pressures) than from a warm responsive home—with its building of self worth and self direction.

20. Orient children more to altruistic service and less to narcissistic amusements and sports.

21. Place specifically greater emphasis on character education of an altruistic, moral and patriotic sort.

22. Teach altruistic manners, etiquette, poise in walking, speech (expression, elocution) listening, etc. and respect for elders—that they may not only make a better world but one day reap respect themselves.

23. Teach writing by writing, with every teacher in his classroom a monitor of the mother tongue, regardless of subject taught—freely utilizing journals, diaries, letters, essays, stories in daily practice.

*24. Reevaluate classroom methods, e.g.,
   a. Teaching more to think (ask *why*, how) than to be reflectors of others thoughts (what's, where's, when's).
   b. Grant more time for child to answer thoughtfully.
   c. Provide daily success experiences—even if they have to be "arranged."

*25. Reexamine college and university teacher education courses to insure that
   a. Prospective teachers are screened early in their college years, before they get well into their professional sequence (by giving them trial classroom experience as student assistants).
   b. Student teachers demonstrate creativity and leadership.
   c. There is a genuine love for and understanding of children and the teaching process, so that, if possible, the motivation to teach transcends the demand for remuneration.
   d. Teachers rebuild the *professional* ethic (vis-a-vis the union ethics), viewing teaching as the highest possible calling.
   e. Great teaching is honored and where possible, financially rewarded.

*26. Develop interinstitutional cooperation at all levels and among all institutions: schools, colleges, libraries, museums, public services (forestry, commerce, etc.), homes, etc.

*27. Continue to provide for the acutely disadvantaged and the handicapped but take care

a. To insure wherever possible that the home is the basic nest.

b. That the unique structured programs for the handicapped are not generalized for all individuals.

*28. For young children, avoid pressure to teach reading skills before the senses, motor coordination, and cognition are reasonably mature and integrated, which is not before the age of 8 to 10 years.

a. In the meantime provide opportunities for free exploration, creative activities, life experiences and experimentation with objects rather than toys as the primary learning medium.

b. Provide small adult to child ratio in order to greatly increase the amount of personal responses and interaction, to provide adult models for children to imitate in social skills, language, manners, etc. and to allow more child rather than adult-initiated and terminated activities. In other words as much as possible imitate the model of the warm, responsive home to plan the school and the loving, consistent parent as the ideal for the teacher.

If we are to believe sociologists J. D. Unwin or Carle Zimmerman, we must spend more time with our children in the home, lest our society, like Greece and Rome, be lost. The conditions are now identical to theirs. Let's have more loving firmness, less indulgence; more work with you, fewer toys; more service for others—the old, poor, infirm—and less sports and amusements; more self-control, patriotism, productiveness and responsibility—which lead to, and follow, self-worth as children of God. Parents and home, undiluted, usually do this best. And they, not the schools, are the only ones who can close the gap and place the ruling hand once again where it belongs.

References

1. C. Zimmerman and M. Frampton, *Family and Society*, (New York: Van Nostrand, 1947).

2. J. D. Unwin, *Sex and Culture*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1932).

3. Urie Bronfenbrenner, *Two Worlds of Childhood*, (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1970), p. 109.

4. Jean Piaget, "The Stages of the Intellectual Development of the Child." *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic* 26 (1962), p. 120-145.

5. J. T. Fisher and L. S. Hawley, *A Few Buttons Missing*. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1951).

6. A. Bandura and A. Huston, "Identification as a Process of Incidental Learning." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 63:311-18, 1961. A. Bandura, D. Ross, and S. A. Ross, "Transmission of Aggression Through Imitation of Aggressive Models." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 52:575-82, 1961. A. Bandura and R. H. Walters, *Social Learning and Personality Development* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963).

7. Dean Hubbard, "Literacy and the American Revolution." Unpublished doctoral paper, Stanford, California, 1975.

8. John Goodlad, "A Study of Schooling: Some Findings and Hypotheses," Phi Delta Kappan, 64:7, March, 1983.

9. *Adult Performance Level Project*, (Austin, Texas: University of Texas, 1983).

10. Walter Lippmann, "Education vs. Western Civilization." An address delivered under the auspices of Phi Beta Kappa at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Irvine Auditorium, University of Pennsylvania, December 29, 1940. *The American Scholar*, Spring, 1941.

11. John Dewey, "The Primary Education Fetich." Forum 25(1898), 314-328.

12. Joseph Wepman in a 1967 speech in Seattle to the International Reading Association (444 N. Capitol Street, Washington, DC 20001). Also quoted by Malcolm Douglass, 1968. Innovation and the credibility gap. Paper presented to the California Elementary School Administrators Association and the California Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, January 1968, Palo Alto, California.

13. Benjamin Bloom, *All Our Children Learning*, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980).

14. John Bowlby, *Maternal Care and Mental Health*, (New York: Schocken Books, 1967), pp. 68-69.

15. Martin Engel, "Rapunzel Rapunzel, let down your golden hair: Some

thoughts on early childhood education." Unpublished manuscript, National Demonstration Center in Early Childhood Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

16. See the author's *School Can Wait* Chapter 3, (Hewitt Research Foundation, P.O. Box 9, Washougal, WA 98671).

17. David Elkind, "Piagetian and Psychometric Conception of Intelligence." Harvard Educational Review 39:2(1969), pp. 319-337.

18. R. S. Moore and Dorothy N. Moore, *Better Late Than Early*, (New York: Reader's Digest Press, 1975). (Now published by Hewitt-Moore Publishing, Waco, TX). R. S. Moore and Dorothy N. Moore, *School Can Wait*, (Hewitt Research Foundation, P.O. Box 9, Washougal, WA, 1979).

19. E. E. Maccoby, "Sex differences in intellectual functioning," in *The Development of Sex Differences*, ed. E. E. Maccoby, (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press), pp. 25-55. J. M. Tanner, *Education and Physical Growth* (New York: International Universities Press). N. Bailey, "Development of mental abilities," in *Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology*, ed. J. Mussen, 1:1163-1209, (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1970). I. B. King, "Effect of age of entrance into grade I upon achievement in elementary school," *Elementary School Journal* 55:331-36 (1955). F. Bentzen, "Sex ratios in learning and behavior," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 33:92-98 (1963). D. L. Mumpower, "Sex ratios found in various types of referred exceptional children," *Exceptional Children* 36:621-22 (1970). N. Cutts and N. Mosley, *Teaching the Disorderly Pupil in Elementary and Secondary School*, (New York: Longmans, 1957).

20. See R. S. and D. N. Moore, *School Can Wait*, Chapter 3; and Bronfenbrenner, *Two Worlds of Childhood*, p. 101.

ELEVEN

The Parents Movement: Grassroots Origins

Marcia Sielaff

Former Congressman John Conlan called it a "floating crap game." That is an irreverent but accurate description of a grassroots parent-based effort to reform public education that pre-dated, by more than a decade, the national awakening to problems in the schools.

Conlan used the phrase in 1975 to explain the avalanche of mail which poured into congressional offices about an obscure, federally funded fifth grade social studies program entitled, "Man: A Course of Study," (MACOS). Members of Congress are accustomed to the organized lobbying efforts of well-funded special interest groups. What puzzled them about the MACOS mail was that it was generated by individual parents who had no special interest to promote (outside of the welfare of their children) and no access to large organizational treasuries.

MACOS became the focus of a congressional inquiry when complaints from Conlan's constituents in Phoenix, Arizona, sparked an investigation of the National Science Foundation and its support of the program. Hearings before a U.S. House subcommittee[1] exposed questionable funding procedures for development and marketing.

After MACOS was developed in 1969, at a cost to taxpayers of over $6.5 million, more than 50 publishers declined the opportunity to market it because of its controversial content. Undeterred, NSF arranged a lucrative contract for a small publishing firm in Washington which enabled the firm to undercut competition from other curriculum materials developed in the private sector. Millions more tax dollars were channeled into direct marketing and promotion of MACOS for the commercial publisher.[2]

Conlan summarized the program for his colleagues in the House:

> MACOS is designed to mold children's social attitudes and beliefs along lines that are almost always at variance with the beliefs and moral values of their parents and local communities . . .
>
> Recurring themes of the 60 lessons include communal living, elimination of the weak and elderly in society, sexual permissiveness and promiscuity, violence and primitive behavior.
>
> Many psychological devices are used through the course, including role playing . . . and encounter sessions in which students are required to openly discuss intimate aspects of their personal lives and those of their families and friends.[3]

Dr. Rhoda Lorand, a child psychologist, described the effect on children who participated in the program:

> The program not only forces the children to be pre-occupied with infanticide and senilicide, as well as the gory details of animal slaughter, it also aims at making the children accepting of these practices. Further, the children are forced to identify with the customs, through role-playing, even of Eskimo myths. In the enactment of one myth, a child about whom I was told was required to play the role of the elderly grandmother who clings to a boat which is about to leave her behind to die. Another child was assigned the role of her offspring who chops off the grandmother's fingers so that she cannot delay the departure . . . It is incredible that this exercise in sadism should be foisted upon a captive audience of children who are undergoing the crucial process of adaptation to our culture and civilization. Equally incredible is the fact that a program so lacking in awareness of children's emotional development and

> needs, as well as in the purposes of education and the processes of character development, should ever have been given government support.[4]

Although Lorand was understandably shocked by the program, MACOS was, and is, consistent with the view—dominant in colleges of education, the National Education Association, many state departments of education and the Washington Education Bureaucracy—that the function of public schools is to bring about such social changes as the educational elite should command.

The reaction of a New York state education official,[5] to objections from a parent in the Albany-based group, Parents of New York United (PONY-U) was typical of establishment response to complaints about MACOS. He chided the parent for attempting to impose her religious beliefs on the school system and politely invited her to take her child elsewhere.

> Should you desire that your child be indoctrinated with your own religious views, that is your prerogative, and there are private academies which will provide that service.

The official made no effort to conceal the fact that if the child were to remain in the public system, he would be indoctrinated with a contrary world view.

> . . . it is the prerogative of the school, indeed, its duty, in a fair and unbiased manner, to develop a student's ability to examine his own as well as other values (systems or beliefs) than his own, in order to assist him to be able to make considered judgements concerning vital issues of his present and future days. That I, as a parent, may be opposed to certain ideas (whatever their nature) does not, and should not, obviate my child's need to know that other views exist . . .

In attempting to label the hapless parent as narrowly religious in contrast with his own enlightened attitude, the New York school official avoided dealing with the parent's legitimate concerns. He simply refused to concede that the parent's view represented a credible opposition.

Whose Children? Whose Values?

The educational establishment has perceived its "duty" to mold children's attitudes as higher than the schools' cognitive function and certainly superior to parental prerogatives to guide their children's spiritual and moral growth.

These educators have failed to come to terms with the idea that they are using the tax supported school system to promote a world view which, in so far as it expresses a consistent philosophy or system of belief, is every bit as religious as any religion.

Alan L. Lockwood of the University of Wisconsin calls this philosophy "ethical relativism:"

> . . . that one person's values are as good as another's; everyone is entitled to his own opinion; and when it comes to morality, there is no one way of showing that one opinion is better than another.[6]

Ronald Berman, former director of the National Endowment for the Humanities, associates this view with the decline in scholastic achievement:

> One reason for the intellectual decline among both academics and students is the belief that all ideas are somehow equal—that what we see on television or assimilate from the counterculture not only deserves academic credit, but means as much as anything stored up by libraries or learned by experience . . . And finally, there is the goal of studying what entertains us, which accounts for the otherwise astonishing presence in the schools of astrology, science fiction and other amusements.[7]

The philosophy described by Berman is one of "value neutrality" and is much beloved by elementary and secondary school educators who incorporate it in values clarification and decision-making programs. Teachers are instructed to be "accepting and non-judgmental" regardless of how repugnant or anti-social students' ideas may be. All opinions are held to be valid so long as they are freely chosen and the product of rational processes.

Dr. Paul C. Vitz, Professor of Psychology at New York

University, challenges the notion that a world view which incorporates God is intellectually less respectable than one which leaves Him out. To Vitz and to many whose children attend public schools:

> . . . the issue of the existence of God is an absolutely central one for any discussion of morality, as well as for any discussion of the problems of contemporary youth. In the last 30 years, there has been a great deal of evidence for the correctness of Dostoyevsky's remark, "If God does not exist, then anything is permitted."[8]

It is not necessary to share Vitz's beliefs to argue that constitutional protection of religious freedom includes parents' rights to bring their children up without interference or subversion from the public school system.

Attorney William Ball, whose legal career is devoted to defending these rights, puts the issue in the form of a question:

> Can we venture to say that a handful of people who don't like Bible reading and praying have rights superior to other people who do not want their children's moral structure destroyed?[9]

The escalation of violence and unruly behavior in the nation's classrooms raise questions about how schools influence children's values. Schools surely must be taken into account along with the erosion of family life and a surfeit of violence on television.

Educational historian Diane Ravitch suggests that the standards schools set, or fail to set, do more to mold character than any number of citizenship courses.

Students learn to be industrious, responsible, dependable and diligent by meeting requirements for performance and behavior. In her opinion, the permissive educational trends of the past 15 or more years have had a detrimental effect on character development.

Ravitch admits to having gone along with the dominant view for a time:

> The main reason, I believe, for my error was that in 1973 my older child was only 11, not yet of the age where the pressures

> of the peer group compete actively against parental values. Now that he is 18, I realize how absurd it is to claim that he can do whatever he wants to as long as he arrives at his decision thoughtfully. I now understand that it is possible to reach very bad decisions, with terrible consequences for oneself and others, through rational processes.[10]

From time to time, Congress has directed various agencies to determine if there are adequate provisions to protect children in federally funded experimental programs. In 1977, the General Accounting Office reported its findings:

> When asked if mechanisms exist at the federal level for protecting students from unwanted value changes or undesirable materials, Office of Education officials stated that they were not formally involved in these matters.[11]

Similarly, the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects found that procedures at the local level did not prevent children from being placed at risk:

> A major difficulty in the protection of subjects of research involving educational practices is that research may be approved by a school board, and introduced into a school system, in ways which afford no opportunity for parents to consent or to refuse to consent, and no opportunity to select an alternative educational setting.

The report further noted that:

> Research designed to evaluate the effectiveness of innovative practices in education (e.g., new teaching techniques, new curricula or modifications of the delivery system) may place children at risk with respect to their education as well as with respect to the risks noted above.[12]

The risks referred to were loss of privacy, loss of self-esteem, and psychological stress.

Researchers have also determined that federal financing of experimental programs has not been justified by the results:

> A 3-year study of many expensive innovations of the past 20 years—including team teaching, open classrooms, use of paraprofessional aides and ways to individualize instruction has

> found that they make little difference in student achievement ... of the 30,000 students examined, those enrolled in programs with a moderate emphasis on innovation and individualization showed the greatest improvement on standardized reading and mathematics tests.[13]

The intransigence of the public school establishment, despite research evidence and parental objections, unified the players of the floating crap game into what Joan Masters of Guardians of Traditional Education in Maryland called "a volunteer army."[14]

Difficult to describe because of its diversity, it has included at various times: Hispanic parents in Tucson, Arizona who obtained a court order to have phonics taught to their children;[15] West Virginia parents concerned about excessively violent and sexually explicit textbooks;[16] Oklahoma parents whose objections to instructional materials resulted in a Grand Jury investigation;[17] the Committee for Positive Education in Warren, Ohio, led by the late Jo-Ann Abrigg who was concerned about educational materials biased against traditional values;[18] Barbara Morris in California;[19] People for Better Education in Anchorage, Alaska;[20] The Brown House Report In Davenport, Iowa;[21] Citizens for Public Education in Portland, Oregon.[22] It would require more space than this chapter allows to list them all or to catalogue their concerns.

It would not be exaggerating the influence of the parents' network to credit it with being the beginning of the grassroots political awakening which was to sweep Ronald Reagan into office in 1980. It was not coincidence that candidate Reagan promised to eliminate the U.S. Education Department and reduce federal interference in the schools. Reagan was articulating a dissatisfaction with education which had become so widespread that even establishment educators such as Dean Myron Atkins of the Stanford School of Education could no longer ignore its existence:

> The schools receive support from the public, I believe to the extent that they are seen as reflecting prevailing community values. If the schools are being used as instruments to bring about changes that do not have general support ... then in

> their impotence to react against those who mandate the changes, people vent their frustrations against the chosen instrument of change . . . the schools.[23]

Gallup Opinion Polls measuring the 15-year decline in public approval of the school system confirm Atkins' observation.

In the hundreds of small publications produced by the players in the floating crap game, the story is remarkably the same. The lines are drawn between the professionals and the parents—between those who pleaded for a return to basics and an end to experiments and change agentry, and those whose programs and purposes were increasingly influenced and financed by Washington, D.C.

Testifying before a congressional committee in behalf of the National Congress for Educational Excellence, a coalition of parents groups, Dr. Onalee McGraw explained what was happening:

> The 'Magic Circle' up in Pittsburgh, Pa., would not have existed unless somebody managed to dig up some Title III funds and put in this type of thing. In other words, basic education has suffered because the excess of money has been there from the Federal government and the philosophy of the educationists who obtain the federal money is to totally emphasize the psychosocial approach to education. So, parent groups around the country have grown up in response to this attack on basic education. Many groups have been in existence since 1968 or 1969. Many of them are very new because it will hit a certain area, and then parents will become very concerned and they form groups. It is a very grassroots populist type of thing, strictly funded by the parents themselves. We have no access to tax dollars.[24]

In recent years, declining enrollment, the tax revolt movement, and the national awakening to scholastic decline has caused school officials to become more conciliatory. Parents are no longer invited to opt out of the system. Too many have already done so as the rapid growth in private schools and the increasing number of children taught at home indicate.

Time will tell whether a new era of cooperation between home and school is dawning. Parents who have been rebuffed in the past should be forgiven if they view the recent emphasis on "parent participation" with suspicion.

A National Institute of Education study of citizen involvement in public education summarizes reasons for skepticism:

> Increased citizen participation, like any policy instrument, can be used or abused. It can be exploited as a mechanism to silence unrest, to divert criticism, to reduce alienation, to coopt the public.
>
> Participation without power is demoralizing for an informed constituency, leading to cynicism and public mistrust of the educational establishment . . . Initiatives increasing public involvement in schools must not be undertaken unless they include a commitment to begin sharing power with citizens.[25]

One of the major problems parents faced was the reluctance of public school educators to comply with requests for information. Even their own children's school records were withheld.

Obtaining instructional materials, copies of grant proposals and research about instructional methods required large investments of time and more patience than most parents could muster.

The Reading Reform Foundation,[26] the Committee for Responsible Education in Tulsa, OK,[27] the Pennsylvania Coalition for Basic Education,[28] the Mel Gablers in Longview, Texas,[29] *California Monitor of Education*[30] and the LITE (Let's Improve Today's Education) organization in Arizona, among others too numerous to mention, helped to fill this need.

No chronicle of the movement to reform education would be complete without mentioning the role of the Reading Reform Foundation and its president, Bettina Rubicam. Hundreds of thousands of children and adults are able to read today because of the dedication of Mrs. Rubicam and her troop of dedicated teachers who travel the country teaching teachers and parents how to teach reading.

The volumes of research attesting to the superiority of phonics in the teaching of beginning reading are ignored by colleges of education. Psycho-linguistics—look-say in drag—is one of the latest guessing games foisted on teachers. Lack of phonics instruction as a chief cause of illiteracy and declining academic performance has been almost totally overlooked in the recent media attention to education.

In many instances, concern about reading method is what causes parents to look deeply into what goes on in schools. Such was the case in Arizona where the LITE group was formed when parents were unsuccessful in obtaining phonics instruction in the Washington Elementary School District in Phoenix.

What began as a local effort spread to other districts, became statewide, and ended up as part of the floating crap game. Upset about chaotic open classrooms, look-say reading and programs such as MACOS, and unable to obtain satisfaction through regular education channels, Arizona parents sought relief in the political arena. They appealed to the state board of education, then to the state Legislature and finally to Congress.

Arizona Citizens for Parental Rights, chaired by Harriet Bade is an offshoot of LITE and exerted national influence when it obtained legislative support for a Parents' Rights Bill. Arizona S.B. 1312[31] became the prototype for the Landgrebe Freer Schools Act, the Buckley Privacy Amendments and the Hatch Amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1974.

The group attracted enough support, through a quarter page ad in Arizona's two largest daily newspapers, to pack legislative hearings on the Parents' Right Bill. The bill was defeated in April of 1973, after more than 15 hours of testimony and a record public attendance forced the hearings to be moved to the floor of the Senate.[32] The portion providing parental access to students' records was finally passed in May of 1974.[33] A few months later, Senator James Buckley put a similar measure into federal statute.[34]

A 1973 column by syndicated columnist Russell Kirk took note of the Arizona effort and warned: "In more states than

Arizona many parents will set their faces against educationists' aspirations to educate the whole child!"[35]

Kirk's warning was prophetic. Parents' Rights Bills on the Arizona model subsequently were introduced in Maryland in 1974,[36] Florida in 1976,[37], Wisconsin in 1979,[38] and passed in Oklahoma in 1981,[39] an effort, according to Myrtle Kelly of Stigler, OK, which was three years in the making.

Perhaps sociologists will one day explain how it was that despite distance and lack of money, these groups became a loosely knit national confederation, able to communicate with, and assist each other, and capable of generating a deluge of mail to Congress.

Embattled educators often attempted to impugn the credibility of players in the floating crap game by accusing them of secret right-wing funding sources. The favorite bogey, of course, was the John Birch Society. It just wasn't so. What money there was came from garage sales, pot lucks and mostly, out of the pockets of parents.

Representative Earl Landgrebe's[40] attempt to pass legislation restricting federal funding to programs teaching cognitive skills failed, but it provided another glimpse of the growing dissatisfaction with federal involvement in education.

> Little did I think when I introduced my Freer Education bill that I would get the kind of result which I have gotten . . . I would receive over 1,500 letters from more than 40 states . . . that I would hear from so many professional educators, superintendents, principals of schools, teachers and school board members and the president of the National School Board Association—writing to me and encouraging me to phase out federal control of education . . . the mothers and fathers came out to express their concern for what was happening to the education of their boys and girls . . . because people are stirred up and they simply are not going to take any more of this . . .[41]

The record will show that people were going to take a lot more of it before the "rising tide of mediocrity" described by the National Commission on Excellence in Education engulfed the system.

As Landgrebe pointed out, some educators were deeply concerned about federal funding. Unfortunately, for the most part, their concerns received no more attention than did the objections of parents in the floating crap game.

Political efforts to exert control over educational decision-makers were frequently defeated by claims that local control was being violated. The *Phoenix Gazette* editorialized in 1973:

> Local control at the school district level doesn't mean control by educators and administrators, but control by the people. And if parents can't look at teaching materials or records and can't have a say on experimental programs, then local control doesn't exist.[42]

It was therefore a major victory—albeit a hollow one because regulations to put the amendment into practice weren't written—when the Hatch Amendment, incorporating the major provisions of the Arizona Parents' Rights Bill, was passed in 1978. Hatch explained the purpose of the amendment:

> Our amendment simply holds that before young children who, in many cases, have not learned to cross a street properly, become subjected to sensitivity training or some other variant of "Walden Three," that we first have the written OK of their parents or guardian.
>
> This whole problem came about when schools started becoming more concerned with children's attitudes, beliefs and emotions rather than providing them with basic education. And what we have today is a situation where dramatically fewer young children can read, write or count; but who have become worldly about sex and drugs and violence.
>
> This does not speak well for the long term emotional stability of the child; and such implicit value changes which attend teaching very young children about drugs and sex, or which challenges their faith in their parents constitute the most vile threat to the American family unit. The techniques used to change young children's attitudes and values are an invasion of privacy in the first degree . . .[43]

Only in 1984 were regulations drafted to give clout to the Hatch Amendment. Can you imagine any branch of government waiting six years to write regulations for, say, a civil rights law? Why is it that parents' rights are considered dispensable? As federal intrusion in the life of the nation grew, so did the scope of the floating crap game. Parents began affiliating with groups whose concerns transcended public education.

As early as 1972, syndicated columnist Paul Scott took note of these nascent political stirrings:

> Pro-family groups are now organizing a national coalition to vigorously oppose massive government child development programs, sensitivity training in schools, in-school sex education and the abolition of neighborhood schools.
>
> Known as the National Coalition on the Crisis in Education, this movement plans to bring the campaign to strengthen the family to the nation's capital . . .[44]

Among the groups mentioned by Scott were: "Crisis in Education Committee of Garden City, Idaho; Unified Concerned Citizens of America, Texarkana, Texas; The National Parents League, Portland, Oregon; League of Housewives, Kingman, Arizona . . ."

The Arizona Experience

According to LITE files, groups were active in no less than 50 states. Their concerns varied from the anti-busing activities of the National Association of Neighborhood Schools[45] to the New York City parents who instigated an investigation of sex education films. Bronx District Attorney Mario Merola commented: "You can be locked up for showing youths in a public theater sex films which are legal in the city's public schools."[46]

In Arizona, the school reform movement was particularly strong. In 1966, the citizens elected Republican governor Jack Williams. Williams then appointed a majority of pro-basic education board members to the Arizona State Board of Education. In 1971, board member and Maricopa County Superintendent of Schools Richard Harris warned the state's educators to "drop experimental programs and get back to basics."[47]

In 1973, a state board effort to impose standards for graduation and promotion was defeated by the educational lobby despite the admission by a Deputy State School Superintendent that without standards, "any diploma issued in the state isn't worth the paper it's written on."[48]

The Arizona Education Association (affiliate of the National Education Association) even fought the watered down requirement that high school graduates be able to read at the ninth grade level—according to local district standards which varied widely—charging that students unable to "meet predetermined reading performance levels" were being "discriminated against."

An AEA spokesman said that imposing achievement standards would be "a denial of the unique individuality of human beings."[49]

State board president Stephen S. Jenkins, with the help of a statewide coalition of parents, led the board to adopt courses of study outlining the basic minimums to be taught in core subjects. Again, the victory was largely hollow because of the reluctance of the Department of Education to distribute the guidelines to school districts. The basic education course guides were subsequently repealed by the next state board and new superintendent. The state's educational establishment formed the Arizona Coalition on Educational Policy to protest the activities of the Jenkins' board and then Superintendent of Public Instruction Weldon Shofstall. The Coalition released a White Paper and vowed to fight this "threat" to the state's educational system.[50]

A performance based teacher certification plan suggested by Shofstall was shot down by the AEA in 1974 because, according to an AEA spokesman, it would set up a system "under which the right of teachers to continue teaching is based largely on whether children learn."

For those who might actually believe that is why teachers are in the classroom, the AEA spokesman explained, "everyone knows that whether a child learns is largely dependent on heredity and environment . . . It would lead to rigid, unimaginative education."[51]

Ironically, most of the recommendations of the Jenkins' board have since become law in Arizona or are in the process of becoming so. Among these are statewide standardized testing, standards for promotion and graduation and basic skills courses of study. The Legislature has also mandated basic skills tests for prospective teachers. It should be noted that, due to public pressure brought about by media attention to the "crisis in education," the same groups that so vigorously opposed these measures in the past are now giving eloquent lip service to supporting them.

Unfortunately, a whole generation—a generation that deserved better than it got—of Arizona children has passed through the school system in the intervening years.

Since 1971, Arizona scores on the verbal portion of the Scholastic Aptitude Test dropped 42 points; compared to a national score decline of 28 points. Average math scores dropped 28 points, compared to a national score decline of 16 points.

Although national scores have leveled off during the past three years—average verbal scores went up one point and average math scores rose two points—Arizona scores have continued to plummet another 11 points on the verbal portion of the test and nine points on the math.

Yet, education spending has long been the largest item on the state budget, consuming 68 percent of all tax dollars raised in the state.[52] During the period of greatest decline, spending on education outpaced enrollment and inflation.[53]

Nationally, the story is the same. Education spending in constant dollars multiplied nearly three times over the past three decades.

In October 1983, George Roche, chairman of the National Council on Educational Research asked:

> If tripling the input did not raise the quality of education or even maintain it, what reason is there to believe that pouring additional money will do the job?

Yet, Arizona's Governor's Committee on Quality Education,[54] an educator-dominated body, recently recommended more money for education, a recommendation echoed by establishment educators everywhere.

It is with a terrible bitterness that those parents who sounded the alarm more than 15 years ago—and were pilloried for their efforts—now see the same solution that caused the problem being put forth once again.

While it is true that the present crisis in education has deep roots within the educational establishment, those roots were well-watered with a flood of federal dollars.

During the 1930s, the progressive education movement exerted strong influence on American educators. Fostered by colleges of education, it can be described as a philosophy which elevates "socialization" over academic achievement. It is based on the premise that society should be restructured through the schools.

When the Soviets beat the United States into space with Sputnik, progressive education was linked to the American lag in scientific achievement. As a result, Congress appropriated funds for the National Defense Education Act in 1958. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act followed in 1965. When President Lyndon Johnson signed the bill into law he stressed the idea that federal support would enable local elementary and high schools to provide a high quality program of instruction in basic skills.[55]

Today the public is hearing that promise again. It obviously didn't work before and there is little evidence that it will work now. Why federal money failed to produce an educational renaissance was explained by the Arizona Office of Post Auditor in 1961 when the auditor was asked to respond to a legislative request to investigate the possible impact of federal funds on the state.

In a remarkably prescient report, the auditor explained that state and local agencies would be able to exercise "little discretionary authority regarding federal aid programs" whose "purposes, limits and other essential features" would be set by the federal government and would not be subject to change by the state. The auditor warned that the inducement to get a "fair share" of the aid being doled out "is overpowering and prevails over considerations which would otherwise prohibit adoption of the program."

Arguments concerning academic merit, federal controls and system autonomy were disregarded in the face of the easy availability of money. Politicians and school boards found the prospect of "free-money"—funds obtained without increasing state and local taxes—irresistable.

The Arizona Post Auditor clearly foresaw the economic consequences. "When programs are financed at the local level, political pressures dictate economy and conservation but when they are financed on the federal level, the political pressures are in the opposite direction."[36]

The late Marilyn Desauliniers, a Virginia parent activist, prepared a position paper entitled "The State of Virginia—An Administering Agency of the Federal Executive" in which she explained why "so many innovative programs and laws have appeared simultaneously with identical programs and laws in other states—and without adequate discussion or debate."

Testifying before the U.S. House Committee on Ways and Means in 1971, Desauliniers observed:

> In public education . . . it has been possible to dictate the exercise of policy-making by federal agencies through selective funding. For through that simple process of funding some directions at the expense of others, it is possible to create a market for the U.S. dollar in school boards and administrations eager to adopt those practices most successful in attracting grants.

The Arizona experience with federal Special Education Law is a classic example. In 1978, The Arizona Tax Research Association made a study of special education in that state. Among the major findings were:

> Arizona taxpayers are paying more money to comply with P.L. 94-142, Education for All Handicapped, than may ever be justified by the amount of federal support.
>
> Arizona legislative action has encouraged districts to overestimate special education students and costs.

> 79 percent of special education students are in the three most poorly defined categories.
>
> Districts with similar ADMs, which are contiguous to one another and share similar populations, show no comparability in the numbers of students enrolled in the three most populous categories.
>
> Program placement judgments are influenced by pupil weighting systems and weighted formulas encourage misclassification of students for fiscal gain.[57]

The Report warns:

> The danger is that the bureaucratic sorting and labeling of children can become a substitute for the rigorous work of really teaching them. The more labels we apply the more excuses we may find for lowering expectations of achievement.

Research findings regarding the effect upon students of the multitude of programs financed by the federal government are not encouraging. In a report prepared for the U.S. Department of Education in 1981 these conclusions were drawn:

> As the number of federal and state programs has grown . . . it has become apparent that they can affect each other's operations and in the aggregate, produce outcomes none of them intended.
>
> The study corroborated anecdotal evidence that "in the aggregate, the programs compete with one another for scarce local program funds, impose administrative burdens on school and district staff, and cause scheduling problems with both the core local program and with categorical programs."[58]

Unfortunately, those who need classroom instruction the most turned out to be those who got the least.

> In districts with migrant Hispanic populations, students were often involved in six and seven pullouts daily . . . Their instructional day was so fragmented that they failed to receive the state-mandated curriculum. By grade five, many had received no instruction in science and social studies.

But the drum beat for more federal dollars for education continues. It is well-orchestrated and virtually drowns out any dissenting voices.

A book entitled *Power and Process* by H. L. Summerfield remains the definitive work on how the education lobby operates. *Power and Process* was reviewed in the April 1975 issue of LITE. Parts of this review are excerpted below.

> The Washington Education lobby is a composite of many voices all seeking to influence the course of public education policy. Among them are the University Associations, School Administrators, and the Vocational Education lobby. Perhaps the most powerful of them all, however, is the giant National Education Association (NEA). The political function of the NEA is to 'raise federal dollars to increase teachers' salaries and to do it under conditions that will protect the teachers' status.' Statistically between 80 percent and 85 percent of all education dollars go for support of teachers' salaries, so any increase in federal dollars will ultimately benefit the teachers union.
>
> NEA's philosophical commitments cannot be ignored when discussing its interest in educational legislation. The NEA is on record many times over as being dedicated to using the schools to accelerate the process of social change in certain predetermined directions. This statement in the NEA Reporter of 1967 can be considered to be fairly typical of NEA objectives, 'In the United States today education has gained the power to change society against the will of the politicians.'[59] The NEA Journal of 1968 elaborates on that theme, "The most controversial issues of the 21st century will pertain to the ends and means of human behavior and who shall determine them. The first educational question will not be, What knowledge is of most worth? but What kind of human behavior do we wish to produce?"[60]
>
> Also among the lobbying groups are the well-financed foundations who are no less committed to the process of social change . . . Though they cannot lobby directly under federal tax laws, they can fund non-foundation people to work on selected projects. These non-foundation people are the ones who push foundation-financed ideas at the congressional level.
>
> Another less well-known, but highly effective and influential lobby, is the Executive branch of government itself.

> Whenever crucial education bills are before Congress, literally thousands of people are brought to Washington (with expenses paid) to make personal appearances at congressmens' offices. These people have their expenses paid by the lobbies and the taxpayer pays again in salaries and substitutes' wages. Unfortunately, parents have no access to such largess . . .

As the Grass Roots See It

Players in the floating crap game learned one valuable lesson regardless of where they lived. They discovered that money was the key and that if only they could cut the flow of dollars over which they had no control, they had a chance to restore basic education and end the ideological manipulation of children.

They are painfully aware that the decline in academic achievement will not be arrested by pouring money into the system. The solution is not extra dollars, but a change in the priorities of the people in charge.

Such a change is unlikely to come from within the system. The strangle-hold of colleges of education on teacher training will have to be broken and qualified individuals from other disciplines brought into teaching. This would raise the quality of classroom instruction and would also dilute the power of the teacher unions.

The management and evaluation skills of principals and other administrators should be improved so that teachers' salaries can be based on performance criteria, including measurements of students' academic growth. The archaic salary schedule of credits earned and years in the classroom long discredited by research, should be retired from use.

The professional component of teacher education, whether it takes the form of in-service training or a fifth year beyond the undergraduate degree, must include phonics instruction for teaching beginning reading.

More time on task, homework and a disciplined environment all can be accomplished without adding a dime to the cost of education. Should these steps be taken, along with a commitment to concentrate on core curriculum, the money saved on remedial education alone would be enough to give deserving teachers a substantial salary increase.

President Reagan's tuition tax credit proposal is attractive because it appears to introduce the much needed element of competition into the monopolistic public school system. However, the risk to the autonomy of private educational institutions should be considered.

The recent Supreme Court decision in the case of Bob Jones University and Goldsboro Christian Schools gave the IRS the power to evaluate religious beliefs and deny tax exemption when belief does not conform with what the Service, in its wisdom, defines as federal social policy.

In 1978 and 1979 the IRS moved to enforce affirmative action guidelines and require private schools to fulfill rigorous conditions to prove that they are not discriminatory.

In the Grove City College case, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that, even though the small Pennsylvania private college accepts no federal funds, federal tuition grants to students constitute federal funding of the college's financial aid program. The court ruled that the financial aid program must comply with Title IX regulations if students are to continue to receive federal tuition payments.

Although few would argue with eliminating unfair discriminatory policies, it is unlikely that federal intervention, once sanctioned by the court, will stop there. Homosexuality is on its way to becoming a "civil right." Could the government penalize private schools which refuse to hire homosexual teachers or which, for religious reasons, decline to follow other federal rules?

If anything has been learned over the past 20 years, it is that government's appetite for power is insatiable and that with money comes controls.

The alarm sounded by the floating crap game has now become a full scale fire drill. It would be foolish indeed to jump back into the flames.

Notes

1. Hearings before the U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976).
2. *Congressional Record*, April 9, 1975 H2585-H2596.

3. Hearings before the U.S. House of Representatives, op. cit.
4. Ibid.
5. Unpublished correspondence dated July 7, 1972 from Donald H. Bragaw, Assistant Commissioner for Instructional Services, State Education Department, Albany, N.Y.
6. *Teachers College Record*, September 1975, Vol. 77, No. 1.
7. *Character*, December 1979.
8. *Character*, September 1980.
9. *Studies in Education*, No. 5, 1977.
10. "Educational Policies that Frustrate Character Development," *Character*, July 1980.
11. Report of the Comptroller General of the United States, *Questions Persist About Federal Support for Development of Curriculum Materials and Behavior Modification Techniques Used in Local Schools*, April 15, 1977 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977).
12. National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, Staff Paper, December 3, 1976.
13. *Impact of Educational Innovation on Student Performance Project Methods* and *Findings For Three Cohorts Project Longstep Final Report*, American Institute for Research, Palo Alto, CA. April 1976.
14. November 29, 1973 speech, Capital Plaza Civic Center, Prince Georges County, Maryland.
15. Part of the desegregation suit brought against the Tucson No. 1 School District by the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Educational Fund. Litigants requested and were granted a phonics class in place of bilingual instruction by a U.S. District Court, August 1978.
16. Charleston, West Virginia, 1975.
17. Honorable Raymond W. Graham, Judge of the District Court, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, 213, C72-2717. Filed 12-28-72.
18. Committee for Positive Education, 868 Kenmore N.E., Warren, Ohio 44483.
19. Barbara Morris Report, P.O. Box 756, Upland, California 91786.
20. People for Better Education, P.O. Box 4-2850, Anchorage, Alaska 99509.
21. The Brown House Report, 1026 E. High, Davenport, Iowa 52803.
22. Citizens for Public Education, 510 S.W. 3rd Street, Portland, Oregon.
23. *Campus Report*, October 29, 1980.
24. Hearings before the U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology on H.R. 11572, January and February 1976, p. 693.
25. Don Davies, Miriam Clasby and Brian Powers, "The Plight of Citizens," *Compact*, Autumn, 1977. Review of the major findings of a 3-year NIE study of citizenship participation in education. Two major findings: Widespread but ambiguous efforts to involve citizens in schools; Continuing domination of educational decision-making by educators.
26. The Reading Reform Foundation, 7054 E. Indian School Road, Scottsdale, AZ 85251.

27. Committee for Responsible Education, 3509 S. 88th, Tulsa, Oklahoma, Regina Brown.
28. Pennsylvania Coalition for Basic Education, 1310 S. Negley, Pittsburgh, PA, Joan Janaro.
29. Mr. and Mrs. Mel Gabler, P.O. Box 7175, Longview, Texas 75601.
30. *California Monitor of Education*, Box 401, Alamo, CA 94507.
31. Sponsored by State Senator Robert Strother, Introduced February, 1973.
32. *The Phoenix Gazette*, March 16, 1973.
33. H.B. 2116, Sponsored by State Representative Bob Hungerford, Introduced February 4, 1974.
34. August 2, 1974 Congress passed "Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act".
35. "Parent's Units Move for School Control", *The Phoenix Gazette*, August 18, 1973.
36. S.B. 196, January 9, 1974.
37. N.B. 501, 1976.
38. A.B. 162, 1979.
39. S.B. 132, June 1, 1981.
40. Landgrebe Freer Schools Act, H.R. 10639.
41. Reported in the April 1974 LITE Letter.
42. *The Phoenix Gazette*, October 25, 1973.
43. *The Congressional Record*, August 23, 1978.
44. "Pro-Family Groups Organizing to Combat Social Engineering", *Phoenix Gazette*, April 20, 1972.
45. NANS, Bill Donofrio, President, 1800 W. 8th Street, Wilmington, Delaware 19805.
46. Mario Merola, District Attorney of Bronx County, New York. *Pony-U-Newsletter*, May 22, 1974.
47. *The Phoenix Gazette*, October 11, 1971.
48. *The Phoenix Gazette*, April 25, 1973.
49. *The Phoenix Gazette*, August 18, 1971.
50. "The Threat To Our Schools", *The Phoenix Gazette*, January 26, 1973.
51. *The Phoenix Gazette*, June 4, 1974.
52. "State Finance in a Nutshell", prepared by Legislative Analyst Robert Lockwood, for the Arizona House of Representatives, January 24, 1984.
53. "Maricopa County Schools, M & O Cost Comparisons based on Attendance & Inflation 1973-83", report of the Maricopa, Arizona Schools Office.
54. "Education in Arizona, Popular Concerns, Unpopular Choices", report of the Committee on Quality Education, 1984.
55. "Legislative History, Education Act of 1965, H.R. 2362," *U.S. Congressional and Administrative News*, 1965—93, pp. 1448-49, 1473.
56. State of Arizona, Office of the Post Auditor, Federal-State Fiscal Research Officer, *Report on Federal Grant-in-Aid Programs in the State of Arizona, Fiscal Year 1961-62*.

57. *Special Education—Promise and PROBLEM*, The Arizona Tax Research Association, October 1978.
58. *The Aggregate Effects of Federal Education Programs*. Jackie Kimbrough and Paul T. Hill, (The Rand Corporation, 1981.)
59. *NEA Reporter*, November 10, 1967.
60. *NEA Journal*, February 1968.

TWELVE

One Teacher's Opinion

Thomas J. Donovan

Through five generations, whether on this continent, or in the British Isles, the occupation most frequent in the families from whom I issue has been teaching school. Starting off the count with two out of the eight great-grandparents, I believe our teachers may total two hundred; more, if we include those who prepared to teach, but didn't. I suspect nothing unusual in this. Many families would find something like it to be the case among their own members, if they examined themselves; and just on this account, teaching can never be a profession having the absolute mystery of Law or Medicine. Numbers are certainly magnified because teaching has been a career possibility for women as well as men over a long period of time, at least since St. Catherine of Alexandria. Perhaps there are studies of such matters. I do not know. But when I myself came finally to retire from the classroom, I began to wonder if anything learned about schooling persisted in family lore, or if reflection on my own experience might be of permanent value, and a guide to the future. Especially have I wondered whether my own time as a student in high school had any permanent effect on me, what I myself may have learned as a teacher in high school, and what judgments I might be prepared to make upon what is done in schools. I offer a memoir and an advisory.

Both of my parents had gone to private schools, and when my time for high school came, I was sent across the river from home to a prep school under the direction of the Holy Cross Fathers, on the campus of the University of Portland. That school has now been long defunct, but they tell me the Fathers are still extant on the premises. The school took boarders, although I was a day dog, as were most of the other students. Coming from another state as I did, I felt pretty much an outsider when I was a freshman, especially since the emphasis laid upon football in the days of my youth was oppressive. Those with small athletic ability, who found a little swimming adequate for their needs, were bound to feel resentment, and to think themselves exploited for the benefit of the football team. Players were recruited from remote and barbarous places like Utah and Montana, and for the most part it was they who made up the contingent of the boarders. The rest of us were supposed to go to the games and yell. Only many years later, at the University of Southern California, did I come to understand the intellectual character of all the movement on the field, and the skill that went into the play. And it was only then, I believe, that I began to see why those ballplayers had such a close relationship with their coaches.

Eventually the advantages of going to school in Portland became manifest. We could go downtown after school and meet the girls from St. Mary's in the booths at Meier and Frank's record department. In those days, you got to play the records before you bought them. I also came to enjoy school itself, despite certain ancient rigidities. For example, we were always seated in alphabetical order, so that over the years the people I knew best were Joe Cochran and Dom Callicrate, on my left, and Tom Drennan and Gus Ebeling, on my right. Don Jeesop and Hal Lyster sat directly behind me, so I knew them, too.

Lately, in retrospective introspection, I have begun to see what the old school wrought in me, and to appreciate the singularity of its best features. We had regular access to a library of a quality not often available to high school students. We could spend undisturbed hours in contemplation of Dore's illustrations for the *Divine Comedy* in its vast leather tomes. We could also make some surprising discoveries in the Dictionary of Egyptian hieroglyphics. The school was staffed with some very good men, and the teacher-student ratio was highly favorable. Teachers who were not members of the Holy Cross community had equal dedication to the education of the young; obviously they were not motivated by hope of worldly gain. They wanted to exercise their special talents, or to coach their chosen sports. A couple of them were the best teachers I ever had.

There was nothing elitist about the school, apart from the games business. We all took the same classes; nothing was reserved for some few blessed with angelic celerity of intellect. Unable to consult vanished records, I feel confident in saying that nine subjects dominated the curriculum. We all had four years of English, including Public Speaking, which my father believed was the most important thing taught in schools. We had Biology, Chemistry and Physics. We had four years of history, four years of mathematics, four years of Latin, four years of Religion. Perhaps Religion was not really a subject, since it was understood that nobody ever flunked Religion; and in any case, the grade was not averaged with the other grades. The period for Religion was half the length of the other periods, and since it was the first thing in the morning, it provided welcome buffering for those who might be late on those days when the Interstate Bridge was raised to accommodate traffic on the mighty Columbia.

I always got my best grades in Mathematics, since I would always do the work to get it out of the way; but my favorite subject was English, in which I always got the worst grades, although I could never figure out why. Actually, I would be at the back of the book when the rest of the class was at the front, reading all the things we were told we could skip, and staying home to write my themes after the due date. In my senior year, however, they made me the editor of the school paper; and I was named Class Poet, filling the role of salutatorian when we graduated. For the long run, the most illuminating thing in the school was probably Latin. I never recovered from the astonishment I felt when it really came home to me that there was *another language*, even one that survived mainly in liturgies, books, and monuments. What this must mean about the nature of the human mind, and about the nature of the world!

It was in Latin class that I learned about Caesar; and about the contours of the Empire; about the stockaded *limes*, keeping out the barbarians, like the Great Wall of China, running along the Danube and the Rhine. When our unit fought along that ancient boundary during the Second World War, I thought about Caesar, and about Mr. Chips' story about the Germans, and wondered how many of the soldiers bridging the Rhine were remembering Caesar. And I wondered what that meant for the kind of world we've got here, after all.

The textbooks we had in high school were dull to the eye; we could hardly have expected anything different. Our most modern text, and the most exciting, must have been *Latin for Today*, copiously illustrated with half-tone drawings that pretty much fixed my visualization of the ancient world. I think it may have been one of the very earliest of the "easy reading" texts. What motivated its choice, I cannot guess, since our teachers seemed to believe it concealed the structure of the language so carefully that no one could possibly learn Latin from its degenerate example. Therefore, we had constant supplementation from Bennett's *Latin Grammar*, dictated to us section after section, and copied down into our notebooks. It was a long time before the systematic nature of declensions and conjugations dawned on me. Excitement and illustrations, therefore, might seem to indicate serious material deficit in a textbook.

Certainly the dull books required a different kind of supplement. Narrative history, whether of the United States or Western Europe, stopped short of the First World War, and needed there no supplement at all, since we heard about all that from our uncles. Because it didn't appear in books, I think it did not seem of the first importance, just part of the lives of some relatives. We used to spend one day a week with the *Literary Digest*, a magazine that suffered precipitous decline for having predicted Mr. Hoover's re-election during my sophomore year. It continued to be used in schools, and it was after my day that a substitute was found for it. More substantial help in history came from the textbooks of an uncle who had been to school with the Benedictines at St. Martin's Abbey, or from my father's, who had been to St. James's School in Bay City, Michigan. Old books were more tightly written than the new, and managed to include fascinating detail on the Merovingians, who continue to provide my paradigm for Third World politics. My Uncle's Cicero and Ovid released some of my allowance in my junior year for non-academic purchases, since I did not have to buy any books for Latin at all. Mirabile dictu, I discovered they contained racy verses in a Spencerian hand about Cleopatra's corset, et eiusdem generis alia plurima. The same year, I got my copy of Long's *American Literature* from Gene Duber, when he was disposing of his effects as he headed for the Naval Academy at Annapolis. That book had many pencilled drawings, elaborately shaded, that established in my mind the veritable difference between boys entering upon their junior year, and men who had already completed it.

While elsewhere improvement of instruction might focus on methods of teaching, I am sure none of my teachers would have been seduced by such modernity. Not for mathematics or chemistry, to be sure, but for most subjects, three or four simple strategies seemed to work. Class usually consisted in our reading aloud from the textbook by turns. Textbooks were important because they were the major tools for teaching us how to think; they were not solely treasuries of facts. We were subject to constant interrogation on the meaning of what we were reading, and were required to restate the material in our own words. I remember my surprise that one might even be asked questions on the portion of the text one was assigned to read aloud to the class oneself. What I learned thereby was that reading and understanding were not two tasks, but only one; and that if one did not understand the text one read, one did no better than a parrot.

Instruction in foreign languages was not different from the close reading of English, only for Latin it was called "translation." Respect for the integrity of the text was validated for us when we found that Caesar raw was easier than Caesar adapted by the authors of *Latin for Today*, when they interposed their New York preconceptions between Roman and Oregonian (and Washingtonian, of course).

For homework we outlined the textbook. Outlining was taught over again every year in English classes, to be sure: capital letters and small letters, Roman numerals and Arabic numerals. But I outlined more than one book before I came to the realization that books had form, and that the form controlled the meaning. How often have I rediscovered since, that the learning of adolescents is exaggerated in their own minds by their mere verbalism, whereas they long continue to suffer agonies of bewilderment, having never consciously experienced the structure of any book they have ever read.

Nothing will make mandated composition a pleasure. But outlining many books will help develop the sense of form that comes so painfully, and is absolutely indispensable for educated thought, whether or not one proceeds further along to any extensive writing.

We took exams, of course. The questions could be answered only by well-organized little essays. I cannot recall that cheating was a problem when I was in high school, since so much weight fell upon the writing, and proportionately less therefore upon mere data. If there were ever objective tests, I don't remember them.

Had I gone to our local public school in those days, the teachers would have come from our own region, and from the region's normal school, well preserved in their provincialisms. Irv Jolliver, an artist who did attend that school, has often said that Grant Wood's *American Gothic* conveys a perfectly adequate impression of his instructors at that time, occasional pince nez or frock coat notwithstanding. Certainly there were excellent teachers there, who opened doors upon the world. But as it happened, the teachers I had came from out of the area; from Chicago, even from Boston. They talked to us about London, Paris, Washington and Rome. Wherever they came from, our teachers had communicable enthusiasms, not only common values, nor just uniform expectations.

What I think I learned from my teachers was chiefly a kind of liberty, a kind of confidence that being human was in itself superior to mere learning, a freedom from that special kind of pettiness that Shakespeare mocks in schoolmasters. In a later day, I am sure that some would have judged them over-qualified at their level of instruction with transcripts of record filled up with courses not ordinarily taught in the high schools of Oregon, and therefore never counted toward certification. But then, they were not interested in education as a mere process, but rather in the great world of noble men and women, of movements, of ideas.

They directed us toward those works of "high vulgarization," as it was called in those days, that made the work of the specialist understandable to laymen: the books of Eddington and Jeans; the books of Harold Lamb on the Crusades, and on the great conquerors; Horace Gregory's translation of Catullus, (with decorations by Zhenya Gay). And if "Religion" was as jejune as I have indicated, in some other class I picked up a genuine love for New Testament history, and for the books of Ramsey and Lightfoot. While I am sure one's basic moral orientation always comes from one's family, I do believe I learned from my teachers in high school the equal importance of accepting one's sexuality and of training in chastity, although there was no such thing as sex education.

It was from those teachers that one could learn about the differences between the Oxford colleges, and the difference between Oxford and Cambridge. Or about a restaurant in Rome whose walls were lined with bottles instead of books, that was nevertheless called La Bibliotheca. Or what Pope Leo XIII said, when he saw the painting of the naked lady inside the lid of the snuff box tendered him by the Marquis. Or the hazards of swimming the Hellespont. Or what Father Delaunay said to the French police when the Fathers were ejected from their Paris house by the anticlerical government.

My favorite teacher, Mr. Edwin Derrah, went into the printing business during my junior year. That was in the depths of the depression. But in my senior year, in answer to prayer, a new English teacher turned up, from the Netherlands, Father John Hooyboer, whose friendship has continued through all these years.

Twenty years after my own graduation from high school, after college, after the years in the army, after riding the G.I. Bill to the end of the line, it came about finally that I would myself enter the family's favorite profession. By one of those convergences of multiple causal chains that startle unbelievers, I was invited to teach at Providence Academy, a private school which my mother and her mother had attended, and to teach what I had years ago been taught: Latin, English and History. I had never thought of teaching high school, and in all my travels I had never taken any of the requisite education courses; but in the emergency I was eligible for temporary certification, and soon made up my deficiencies.

Going back to high school, so to speak, I felt a kinship with John of Salisbury; for returning to Oxford after a life in diplomacy, he found they were talking there about the same things they had talked about in the days of his youth. Thus, the curriculum at the Academy was no different than it had been in my own high school; except that history now included the First World War, not yet of course the Second. But the textbooks were really into the Great Depression. I think the curriculum had not changed from my father's time and my uncle's time; not perhaps from my great-grandfather's time. I believe that in 1860, Modern History stopped short of the Crimean War. One would have been hearing about it from the uncles.

Not everything could be the same. The greatest surprise was not in the Academy's offerings in Art and Music, which would have been foreign to my school. It was in the teaching materials that were placed in my hands, the textbooks and the audiovisual aids. I could not believe it. The textbooks I now encountered were miniature museums. The English books included portfolios of paintings of the great masters. The texts for American History were augmented by materials of social history that twenty years before would have made intelligible the aridities of American politics. The Piltdown Man no longer functioned in World History, but the sweep and coherence of Europe's many centuries was there, even though the Merovingians were still getting short shrift. The Latin texts were still "easy reading," but the Neo-Latin passages of ***Latin for Americans*** had been composed mainly by Paul Pascal of the University of Washington, and the linguistic structures were made plain. The half-tones of ***Latin for Today*** were bettered by four color press.

I do not remember that we had audiovisual aids when I was in high school. I do not know what value audiovisual aids may really have. Paul Pascal claimed the teacher should be the only audiovisual aid, as the only teaching instrument should be the book. I do know, they were a source of wonder and delight to me, when I discovered them, and I thoroughly enjoyed entertaining the students with film strips and slides in the darkened classroom. When I first started teaching, neither I nor the students were saturated by exposure to television, and a teacher's transparencies of the Grand Tour might instruct and motivate at once. Educational films, prepared with instruction in mind, seemed to me too hideously condescending for use, whereas commercial films concentrated on subjects, not on process, and were enjoyable in themselves. When I was in high school, the only movies we saw were in the theatres downtown.

My colleagues, when I began teaching at the Academy, were like the teachers who had taught me. They were more interested in the world out there, in the play, or in the poem, and in the reactions of their students, than they were in educational process. They had the same views of administration that I remembered from Columbia Prep. When I was a student, I did not know anything about administration; and at that time I am sure I must have seen administrators as essentially disciplinarians. At the Prep, and also at the Academy, since the faculty ran the school, and helped in raising funds to supplement a modest endowment, administration was regarded as a burden, subordinate to work with the students. Consequently, administrative positions were rotated, so that no one would be overwhelmed or fall into depression.

Another attitude toward administration prevailed in the public school where necessity placed me before long, where teachers did not raise the funds and did not run the school. Just about then, I began to realize that a guarantee of money by the state brings a host of problems in its train. For the administrators are separated from the teachers, by that very guarantee, and become the employers of the teachers. To me, the greatest difference between private schools and public schools is the fact of that separation. In my personal situation, of course, I was getting more money; but somehow I had lost ultimate control of my working conditions, and I felt that I had lost my voice.

John Saindon, a friend long in public education in California, gave me some advice in the course of my transition from the private school: "They will tell you that if you have any problems, you should ask for help. But I say unto you: Don't have problems. And if you do, don't ask for help."

Absolutely the only problems in schools are problems of student behavior. In my own youth, and in my own school, indocility had no defense. Male or female, the teacher had unquestionable moral authority in the classroom, and the physical presence to enforce it. The anecdotes that made Miss Dove a recognizable character were familiar and not fiction. At the Prep, they had recruited guys that liked to hit, and they wanted winners, so they were prepared to live with the consequences. If your conversation ever distracted your teacher, he'd throw the eraser at you. Prudence mightily discouraged rashness, when you might be cuffed by the impatient bear. But by the time I myself came to teach, discipline in public schools had already become a quagmire, a problem in public relations, a contest between the races, the sexes, the agencies, undoubtedly compounded by the tendency of many parents to let the school take over larger areas of responsibility for the young of the community.

Perhaps in reality there is at least one other problem; a kind of reflex of the problem of student behavior, and related to burn out. All the teachers in public schools do not work equally hard, since some teachers have no work to take home. Long ago, the National Council of Teachers of English recommended that English classes not exceed twenty-five students, that the English teacher's load be no greater than one hundred and twenty-five students. But in my experience, only specially funded federal programs ever were kept to those numbers. And in my experience, only one administrator really believed that this was an area where teachers needed help. He was always able to find money hidden somewhere in the complexities of his budget for aides to correct student writing. But unless he were Paul Gutierrez, you might go many years before getting help with your overload, had you asked for help.

The curriculum at Hudson's Bay High School was essentially the same as at the Academy. There was certainly a more generous number of electives, as there is the possibility of providing a comprehensive high school when the school reaches a certain population. Small public schools tend to become unlikely because they have money first, then administrators, then teachers, then students, and then they can build their curriculum. But in the fifties and sixties students were getting an excellent education in the traditional round. I was using the same textbooks I did across the way, *Latin for Americans, Adventures in Appreciation, Adventures in American Literature.* It is true there was a kind of under-curriculum: not everybody had to take World History, not everybody had to take English the senior year; but the superiority of our graduates was recognized by the colleges, and we produced a respectable number of Merit finalists.

I have never known more dedicated teachers than those at Hudson's Bay. There was an interesting difference noticeable between those who had gone to the teachers' colleges, and those who had been to Lewis and Clark, or Reed, or Vanderbilt, or Yale. Teachers from the colleges turned out a slicker package; they used simulations, and were prone to rely on objective tests. They tended not to read the great books, but to give weight to educational research; and they had a pronounced appetite for administration. Something like this was the case throughout our district. Our teachers were able to co-operate with each other on a common project, to do their own homework, and to make each other look good. When William J. Bennett got to know us, before he ended up heading the National Humanities Foundation, he began referring to Vancouver as "the Athens of the West."

I have emphasized the great stabilities in my experience with schools; but there have been instabilities. Sometimes we seemed to ride a roller-coaster. Just at the time when I began to teach, two books critical of the American educational establishment were beginning to circulate. One of these was a general indictment of American public education entitled *Educational Wastelands*. The other dealt with a narrower issue, *Why Johnny Can't Read*. But a worse blow to the declining prestige of educational theorists came in October, 1957, when the Russians put their first satellite into orbit. Americans found it hard to express their outrage: that we were not the first with every novelty was insupportable. So deeply were the public schools believed to be the bulwark of the nation's liberty and superiority, that our betterment by foreigners who threatened our liberty was perceived as a failure of our schools.

Always uneasy about Russian success, whether in chess, science or the knowledge of foreign languages, we now decided we must emulate them. Moreover, there was here a great opportunity for the involvement of the Federal government in the nation's schools. The result was a National Defense Education Act, hurried through Congress before we would fall even further behind. A National Science Foundation was created and fabulously endowed, followed in due course by a National Humanities Foundation. And so now there was money provided by the Federal government in the sure and certain hope of correcting a whole range of the country's ills.

Judging by events, it would doubtless seem that old ways of doing things were now discredited, that new approaches were clearly in order. But there was no refined evaluation of current practice to determine precisely which of the old ways were discredited. Nor was there any surety that new approaches were functionally appropriate. Without undue caution, we found ourselves in the era of the New Social Studies, the New Mathematics, the New English, the New Ways of Learning a Foreign Language. Not that there was a common newness among all these approaches; no coherent viewpoint came to expression. And yet all the varied approaches did have a great common failing: they regarded only the extremes of the psychological span: doubtfully meeting the needs of the very bright or even the very dull, they confused the majority of ordinary students. They confused also their parents, and sometimes frightened their teachers.

The fateful history of the New Math is a scandal known to everyone. But our school district can provide some other stories, exemplifications only of what has happened across the land.

For many years, attacks had been constant on the teaching of traditional grammar in the schools, and in the post-Sputnik age there seemed to be a grand chance to replace it wholly with a new grammar as conceived (we were told) by modern linguistics. The machinery by which textbook adoptions were made ground through its many phases, and our district adopted Robert's English series. We got the books. But while some teachers were conversant with linguistic science, most weren't, even though conventionally well prepared. What would one expect might happen to instruction in grammar? What do you suppose happened to Robert's books?

Teachers of foreign languages, even Latin teachers, who took advantage of the special programs available in those days, were able to attend good schools abroad, to get higher degrees, or just to travel in Germany or Spain, or go to Rome, so that the preparation of our teachers was quite significantly enhanced. Our school district has always had many people willing to invest themselves. Presently, however, they found themselves facing a unique problem.

One of the marvels of those post-Sputnik years was the sudden proliferation of educational hardware. At that time there was talk of "teaching machines," which some administrators hoped might replace teachers, who had proved so ineffectual, or might at least make instruction teacher-proof. If foreign languages were to thrive in American schools, the greatest teaching machine of all was bound to be the Language Lab.

There were school districts known to us where the administrators to a man believed that "Foreign Language" was a language, as though there were two languages, "English" and "Foreign." Attempts to probe this special ignorance generated hilarious stories that we told each other at Gearhart, where teachers of foreign languages met annually in convention. That the speech of all foreigners is unintelligible does not mean they are all speaking the same language. That some of them do not even understand each other does not mean that some are more stupid than others. (*Ur-dumbeit* can almost always be ruled out as an explanation for any human phenomenon.) There is not really a special language called "Foreign," but a foreign language must be EITHER German OR Latin OR Russian OR Spanish, and hiring a Foreign Language Teacher reasonably requires a decision about the language the school wishes to offer, since qualifications for foreign language teaching vary for each of the languages . . . *und so weiter.*

The administrators of our district were naturally more sophisticated. But when the federal government was willing to buy language labs, the availability of all the money fascinated school board members, and some of them regarded the opportunity heaven sent to buy all that wonderful stuff during their term of service. At the time, one of our local magnates dominated the board (he had started out his career as a body guard), and since he was used to making purchases of significant hardware, and capable of handling great sums of money without nerves, it was he who selected the machinery he thought appropriate for all three of our high schools.

Most of the time, school boards take direction from the professionals, and sometimes we may suspect that they are manipulated by professionals. But in this instance the administration suffered the intrusion of a board member in a professional realm, and did not insist that teachers be at least consulted. Supporting power is not always the worst way to go, and there are certainly cases where the administrators would be at least as well qualified as the teachers within a given area; but at the time the purchase of the language lab was contemplated, there could be no doubt that it was the teachers who had special competence.

The greater error was to select one kind of Language Lab out of many, all that expensive modern hardware, without considering its peculiar vulnerabilities to the day's successive classes of adolescents, and without consulting the opinions of teachers about its peculiar mechanical limitations which notably lessened its usefulness as an instrument of instruction. When the software that had been purchased with the Lab finally arrived, some teachers found the books and programs so repugnant that they never used them, preserving carefully the pitiful textbooks of a former day, even for many years. They long outlasted the Language Lab.

Expectations that machines would revolutionize the teaching of foreign languages in American high schools were doomed to frustration. When the regional head of the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages came to inspect our school's new equipment, he asked us the fateful question: "What are they going to do when they find out you can't teach the language by spinning tapes?"

The answer came before ten years were out. The Language Lab was disassembled, because the room it occupied was needed for remedial reading instruction, and the language lab "stations" became "study carrels" in the library, which had become "the media center." In the meantime, enrollments in foreign languages collapsed, as other programs expanded and other empires grew, depending upon adventitious funding from outside the district: Drivers' Education, Family Life Education, Vocational Education, and above all, Reading.

While we were working through the New Math, the New Social Studies, and the Language Lab, and before our prophets could tell what the end would be, my days in the classroom had a happy tonality. The students were open, laughed at their teachers' jokes, accepted correction, took prizes, won games. There seemed to be a wonderful kind of growth within the country; new schools were being built, old patterns of segregation were giving way before the generous spirit of Liberty. And even young Republicans took orientation from John F. Kennedy.

When Mr. Kennedy came to Portland during his campaign, and walked into Howard Hall, and up onto the stage where I had received my high school diploma in 1935, he looked as though he himself might have been a student there those twenty-seven years before. When I saw him next, the President of the United States addressing the Romans on the Campidoglio, he appeared like the very incarnation of his generation. Even mocking the Kennedys was a mode of participation in their style of life; even the malice that made delightful after all the attempt of Mrs. Kennedy's sister to enact *Laura* on television. High school students never before or since have had such a President to relate to. Nor had their teachers: he knew and used all those figures of speech. He also knew their names. He was a bond joining teachers and students to each other. His assassination changed all those identifications, juvenile or ironic.

With the passing of time, it seems to me more and more that the assassination broke the wholeness of this country. Many years later, in a play called *Vanities*, there was an episode in which the announcement of the assassination in a high school gymnasium is used for purely cynical effect. When the play came to be written, an effect of that sort could be considered dramatically plausible. It would not have been thought of in 1963.

The decade after the assassination was perhaps the most difficult of all my years of teaching. It was a decade of insousiance and rebellion. All the wonderful characteristics of the young that make them naturally teachable were in occultation. The war in Vietnam occupied more and more the thoughts of the students as the possibilities of service in the war became nearer to actuality for them. We soon had our own graduates in the services, whose deaths so far away seemed incredible. In the colleges, of course, protests continued to mount through the years. But then there were race riots in the Middle West, in the East, in California, and more assassinations. The fear and the rebellion were a kind of fever, spreading across the country, and up the coast. We heard about principals in California high schools whose careers were abruptly terminated when they proved incapable of controlling students, and we dreaded what might be in store for ourselves.

Students in our schools were reading *The Late Great Planet Earth*, and a lot of them were already living out the Apocalypse. They read *Future Shock*, and persuaded themselves that the coming years would be so totally different from anything in the present that school was a kind of absurdity. The news magazines were proclaiming a permanent sexual revolution and the death of God. *The Secular City* described the withering away of Christianity, its inevitable transformation into other forms. Twenty years later, however, it seems that the announcement of God's death was somewhat premature. The City was possibly secular only to the myopic eye of an evanescent ideology. And the sexual revolution has been officially called off in the interests of sanity and health. We learn all this from the very authorities who got students and teachers upset in the first place.

During the academic year that began in 1969 as the antiwar movement peaked, and ended in 1970, when schools began closing early, after the melodrama at Kent State, we saw major efforts by our administration to cope with student unrest, which many believed now constituted a norm of participatory democracy. It was that year we welcomed a new principal, brought in from outside the district, and he had a new idea. If the students wanted to do their own thing, we should deliberately arrange for it to happen. Therefore, faculty were asked to dream up courses, however wild, which they might personally like to teach. A great number of course offerings were proposed, and we wondered what machinery would be brought into play in order to prune the list for the students. No one anticipated that our new principal would personally and without any consultation prepare the pre-registration forms that offered students the whole number of our wild dreams. The machinery brought into play for pruning the list was student choice. Our course of studies that would have been recognizable to my great-grandfather, that was precisely what school meant to my father and mother, to my uncles and to me, was quite swept away. It was a time when all subjects came to approximate the "Religion" of my own school days: no one was supposed to flunk anything.

Within the limits of state law and student prejudice, we had a wholly voluntary curriculum. Students themselves were not so egalitarian that they would permit abolition of all distinction between sophomores, juniors, and seniors; the state would not permit voiding its minimum requirements. But the "Biology" we had known was dissolved by student choice into "Ecology," and "Home Farming" (doing the lawn), and "Marine Biology" (promising a trip to Cannon Beach at neap tide). The Social Studies Department had takers for "Environmental Studies," and for "History of the Non-Western World." Students enrolled for "Sports in Literature," and "Men and Machines," sponsored by the Language Arts Department. "Witchcraft" and "Modern Poetry" had appeared on the pre-registration forms, but did not find their minimum audience. To my great surprise, some of my own proposals were picked up by sufficient students, so that I found myself with three sections of "Anthropology," "The Bible as Literature," and "Classical Literature and Mythology." Horace Gregory's translation of the *Metamorphoses* came into paperback at just the right time (with illustrations by Zhenya Gay).

It took the school ten years to recover from this debacle, to root up these amaranthine weeds that suffered no flowers save their own to mount. And to get back to basics. Just in time for the computer revolution and Hi Tech.

In the deteriorating climate of the late sixties, something more than teacher preparation seemed to be needed for the improvement of the schools. Someone had noticed that administrators could have a constructive part to play in instruction, if only they understood what teachers were trying to do, and so were initiated a series of national workshops that joined administrators and teachers into teams, in the hope that they could learn to work together for betterment of the curriculum. Inspired by John Marshall, an administrator of unusual openness, our school district sent teams to two such workshops, and it happened that I was a member of both teams in turn.

Sponsored by the National Science Foundation and the Center for Education in the Social Sciences, a Resource Personnel Workshop brought together in Boulder, Colorado, for several weeks during the summer, ten teams from across the United States, representing different geographic areas and different types of schools. Unfortunately, it was organized by those educational theorists who believe there is absolutely nothing that everybody has to know. Moreover, it was in the days when sensitivity training was having its vogue. Our team was not particularly happy or well regarded because we were resistant to our mentor, and were judged much too task oriented. Emphasis fell so heavily upon process that we were immobilized. Ostensibly we were brought together to observe the demonstration of new social studies materials, chiefly in anthropology and economics, and to learn new viewpoints in social studies. We got the feeling before long that touting the new materials our district was to adopt, and we were to take home and use, far outweighed any other purpose the workshop might have. It was apparent that secondary teachers were regarded as functionaries, even as empty drums, dependent upon college professors for their subject matter, and upon educationists for their methods. The materials we had been brought to Colorado to observe were indeed teacher-proof; anybody able to read the directions could make them work, without having the bother of understanding them. That teachers might be human beings having access to the same reality as professors and functioning in the same world was an idea that had not yet toppled feudalism among educationists, even though eighteen year olds had already gotten the vote.

In the years when the country sometimes seemed in its death throes, the years of Watergate and Charles Manson, the Oil Embargo and Patty Hearst, there was nevertheless something going on that was the high point of all my teaching career. The second time I was a member of a school district team was totally unlike the first. Developed by the National Humanities Faculty, the Question of Authority Project in which our school district participated was intentionally a three year program. Not only were the teams brought together at different places across the country for three successive summers, but there were lectures by Humanities Faculty members in the school districts, seminars organized by local participants, and involvement of the local community in discussions of the project's theme. It was that theme of *authority* which made the project quite different from anything that had preceded it in American education. All the humane disciplines were represented by the Faculty: artists, political scientists, anthropologists, lawyers, philosophers; and the function of *authority* was examined in each of the humanities in turn. The plain truth that the country had been undergoing a crisis of *authority* had escaped the people in the schools, who had repeatedly accommodated to the threat of force, and who consistently presided over the dissolution of subject matters. It is hardly surprising that the young could anticipate total change, or that the old saw mind at the end of its tether.

I do not know whether or not the Project was thought to have attained the maximum impact originally hoped for. It made a considerable difference in the professional lives of our own team members, securing sanity and restoring faith. It stiffened some spines when the time was ripe for a few important decisions regarding curriculum. However, the team itself was never used as such by the district. The money had been poured out, and when the money stopped, everything was as it had been before.

The assassination of President Kennedy revealed a great many irrationalities in this country: the imperfect justice, the greed, the cowardice, the folly. Through the twenty years after, we have been coming to face the truth about ourselves as a nation that we could by no means have faced back then. I think we may be coming to face the truth about education. Not only must we come to recognize the cyclical nature of our distress. but we must identify its sources, and attempt to do something about them.

It is somehow in the public funding of education that the problems of education are most manifest, especially perhaps in the Federal funding that we once thought would end all problems. Programs recognized as dubious, or even as splendid, have been justified together on the grounds that "the money is available." The more remote from the school itself the source of funding, the more bizarre the effects on the curriculum. The larger the disposable monies, the more likely it is that unilateral administrative decisions will liquidate existing programs to accommodate novelty, and the more likely that novelty will be unilaterally abandoned when the money runs out. If there is no constancy in our schools, how can there be any way to secure integrity in education?

Well, the great discovery that has illuminated my reflections on the time I have spent in schools, on both sides of the desk, has come to me as a complete surprise. The lesson I have taken, contrary to natural inclination, regards the significance of sports in secondary education, sports considered as a subject matter to be inculcated. While others have seen their subject matters transformed or eliminated, have endured a series of crises in reading, in writing, in mathematics, in social studies, in foreign language, the world of the games has persisted, a city seated on a hill. I can only conclude that our coaches have been our best teachers. The results of their labors are submitted to a candid world, and we know who has been taught to play. and who hasn't. So, it seems to me, the results of any pretended education ought rightly to be brought to judgment. As a matter of fact, this has been happening, and the results are a cause of almost universal complaint.

If success in athletics furnishes a model, then I think we ought to take the coaches as the models for other teachers. They alone have been able to hold students to a maximum performance, and they alone have held themselves to an ideal of accountability. They alone of American teachers have not submitted to direction from administrators who know less than they about their proper subject matter.

The greatest obstacle to good schooling is surely the separation of administration from teaching. When we see that coaches have been eminently successful in their proper function, we should not be surprised to realize that coaches alone have been able to preserve both administrative and financial responsibility within the area of their expertise.

I am inclined to press on from the lesson I have learned. The current tendency to prefer for school administrators a different training from that judged appropriate for teachers, even to spare administrators from the classroom from the beginning, can only accelerate the decline of education. Administration of schools must be closer to the exchange between teacher and student, not ever more remote, or attempted by any not party to that exchange. And so I would think teachers ought to aim at taking control of the school, to claim responsibility in all those areas now denied them. To be sure, any effort along that line would subject teachers to the discipline of the real world; it would be possible only for teachers who themselves had a coherent education, as well as a great deal of courage. For it certainly would imply Disestablishment.

There is only one reason why private schools weaken and decline, and we know for certain what it is: failure of administration. There is never any national outcry for the reform of private education; students go over to the competition. So do teachers. Columbia Preparatory School continued to operate through very bad economic times, because it was a good school; it failed in good times, not because it failed to realize the ends for which it had come into being, but for want of will in administrators who were not teachers. After its hundred and ten years, Providence Academy one day closed its doors, even though the school was fulfilling its purpose, because administrators who were not teachers no longer had any clear sense of their own mission. If such schools had secured a guarantee from the state for unconditional financial support, inertia would have carried their administrators indefinitely, with what effect on their teachers we could predict. We have that model in public education. The way to keep schools on task is to take away the guarantee and to restore the conditions of the free market in education.

Across the years, and across cultures, people the age of our high school students are ready for the acquisition of the rhetorical arts: speaking, reading, writing. Across the years, and across cultures, the tests for competence in those arts remain the same. Schools whose students show they have been taught those arts are the schools to whom the future will belong; but schools like students must ever be kept on task.

Contributors

RONALD REAGAN is the 40th President of the United States and former two-term Governor of California.

WILLIAM BENTLEY BALL, one of the nation's pre-eminent constitutional lawyers, has been lead counsel in litigations in 20 states and in 19 cases before the Supreme Court of the United States, including the landmark decision in the Amish case, *Wisconsin v. Yoder*. Ball was chief counsel in the *Rudasill* and "Studs Terkel" cases to which his article refers. He is the author of various law review and other articles including: "Population Control: Civil and Constitutional Concerns," in the *Journal of Religion and the Public Order* (1967); "Religion in the Public Schools—The Post Schempp Years," and contributor to *Freedom and Education: Pierce Case Reconsidered*, and to *Church, State and Public Policy*. Ball has his offices in Harrisburg, PA.

STEPHEN ARONS is an Associate Professor in the Department of Legal Studies at the University of Massachusetts. Arons has done extensive writing on education in various journals and books, recently "First Amendment Critique of Schooling" in *Public School Monopoly*, "Educational Choice: Unanswered Questions in the American Experience" in Casimir: *Family Choice and Schooling*, "Constitutional Litigation and Education Reform: Canada's Opportunity," analysis of American Education ligitation in the light of Canada's new Charter of Rights and Freedoms (accepted for publication in Canada as part of a book, Manley-Casimir, ed.). Arons holds a B.A. from the University of Pennsylvania, graduating Cum Laude and Phi Beta Kappa in American Civilization. Arons received his Juris Doctor from Harvard University. Arons is a member of the Massachusetts Bar and the Federal District Court Bar.

RAYMOND S. MOORE is the President of the Hewitt

Research Foundation in Washougal, Washington. In recent years Dr. Moore and his wife have pioneered the movement to teach children at home. Moore has authored over 50 books and monographs, and most recently co-authored *Home-Grown Kids* and *Home Spun Schools* with his wife, Dorothy Moore. Moore received his M.Ed and Ed.D from the University of Southern California.

ROGER CLEGG is the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Policy, Department of Justice. The Office of Legal Policy has primary responsibility for the Administration's school discipline initiative in the Department of Justice. Clegg has been at the Department of Justice since 1982. Clegg received his Juris Doctor degree from Yale Law School in 1981 and his B.A. degree from Rice University in 1977.

JAMES W. LOGERFO is an Adjunct Assistant Professor of History at Kean College of New Jersey. LoGerfo received his A.B. from Hunter College, his A.M. from Columbia University and his Ph.D from Fordham University. LoGerfo has been certified to teach Social Studies K-12 and as a Principal/Administrator in the State of New Jersey. LoGerfo has written extensively in the fields of history and education. His articles have been published in *Ideas, The Harper Encyclopedia of the Modern World, The Augustan, Eighteenth Century Studies*, the *Maryland Quarterly* and *Education Week*.

MARCELLA D. HADEED is the Director of the American Education Coalition, a national organization helping parents regain control of the public schools. In this capacity, Hadeed has written Action Kits for parent activists, including *How To Form An Effective Parent Group, How To Be An Effective Grassroots Lobbyist, How To Get Elected to the School Board* and *A Blueprint for Classroom Discipline.* Hadeed graduated from Gonzaga University with a B.A. in History and was certified to teach secondary school in Washington State. Hadeed is a candidate for a Juris Doctor degree from Willamette University School of Law.

LINDA CHAVEZ currently serves as the Staff Director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, to which she was appointed in December, 1983. Prior to this, she served as assistant to the President of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), AFL-CIO, Al Shanker. Chavez was editor of AFT's quarterly magazine, *American Educator*, during 1982-83. During the Carter Administration, she was a consultant to the President's Reorganization Project of the Office of Management and Budget. In 1977, Chavez was special assistant to the deputy assistant secretary for legislation (education), Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Chavez was previously a member of the professional staff of the Civil and Constitutional Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee and taught at the University of California at Los Angeles and the University of Colorado.

THOMAS R. ASCIK is a Senior researcher, Program on Educational Policy and Organization at the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education,. Ascik has been at the Institute since 1981. Ascik was a member of the Reagan Transition Team for the Department of Education. Prior to that he was a Public Policy Analyst at the Heritage Foundation in Washington, D.C. Ascik is a member of the Virginia State Bar, the Council on Basic Education and the Educational Excellence Network.

LAWRENCE A. UZZELL is the President of Learn, Inc., an education and research foundation in Washington, D.C. Uzzell is a former employee of the U.S. Department of Education, the U.S. Senate Education Subcommittee and the U.S. House Education and Labor Committee. Uzzell has been a lecturer and panelist for groups ranging from the Twentieth Century Fund to the Conservative Political Action Conference. His essays and articles have appeared in publications ranging from *Education Week* and *Education Times* to *National Review* and *The Wall Street Journal*. Uzzell graduated from Yale University in 1972.

BENJAMIN H. ALEXANDER was chief administrative officer of the University of the District of Columbia for one year and Chicago State University for eight years. He accepted the presidency of the Chicago institution of higher education in 1974 after having completed a twenty year career as a research chemist and top level administrator with the federal government in Washington, D.C. Dr. Alexander is listed in American Men of Science, Who's Who in Government, Who's Who in America, and Personalities of the West and Midwest, among other biographical publications. He has been featured in magazines and other publications including *Ebony, People, Sepia*, and *Change*. Dr. Alexander has published more than 45 research papers in chemical and related journals, written over 150 articles for general publications and newspapers, and co-owns four U.S. patents assigned to the U.S. Government. Alexander is a fellow of the Academy of Science in Washington and an Academy Member of the Washington Joint Board on Science Education in Washington.

PRESTON M. ROYSTER has held numerous positions of educational leadership which included service as Commissioner of Education, Region III, Philadelphia and served as researcher in family life and early childhood education. In addition, he served as Rector of the Board of Visitors at Virginia State University. Royster's publications include writings on community involvement in teaching, teacher education, education of the blind and school desegregation. Royster holds a Doctorate in Public Administration and an honorary Doctor of Laws (LLD) Degree.

MARCIA SIELAFF is currently an editorial writer and a columnist for the *Phoenix Gazette*, but has been a parent activist in the Arizona public schools for a number of years. Sielaff graduated in the last class under Maynard Hutchin's tenure at the University of Chicago. (Sielaff had entered the program from her sophomore year in high school.) Sielaff and her husband have been in Phoenix for 23 years and son number three was the reason for her original involvement in education. He entered the school system just as the open classroom fad hit and shortly after the district dropped its phonics program for look-say programmed reading. Sielaff was the Arizona Coordinator for the Reading Reform Foundation, a member of the Arizona Basic Goals Committee for Social Studies, a research Assistant for the Arizona State Board of Education and a member of the Arizona Textbook Selection Committee for Social Studies. From 1971 through 1981 Sielaff was the editor of LITE (Let's Improve Today's Education) a monthly research report on education.

THOMAS J. DONOVAN is employed with the Vancouver School District in Special Services (Substitute Program). Donovan retired last year after teaching at Hudson's Bay High School in Vancouver, Washington for twenty-one years. Prior to that Donovan taught at Providence Academy in Vancouver, Washington. At the present time Donovan is collaborating with Dr. Edwin J. Delattre, President of St. John's College, Annapolis, on a book about in-service education in the humanities for secondary school teachers; and with Dr. Roberta Markman, University of California, Long Beach, in the preparation of a *Guide to Short Stories in World Literature* for the National Council of Teachers of English. In 1975, Donovan collaborated with Dr. Edwin Delattre on *Why Reason? A Conversation with Edwin J. Delattre Conducted by Thomas J. Donovan.* Donovan is a member of the National Council of Teachers of English, Committee on Comparative and World Literature, Vancouver Education Association, Pi Epsilon Theta and American Classical League.

$14.00

EXCERPTS FROM A BLUEPRINT FOR EDUCATION REFORM

“Yes, indeed we are a “nation at risk.” But the risk is lessening, we're turning things around. America is on the move again and at the heart of this change is an education reform. A grassroots movement of concerned citizens has emerged.”

— Ronald Reagan
President of the United States

“Recent opinion polls show that the more education a person has, the less likely he or she is to be proud to be an American. What causes this inverse relationship between years of formal schooling and love of country? Clearly, a change has taken place over the last ten years in the way in which our schools teach civics and that change may have contributed to this inversion. At best, what children learn in school today about their country and its political system may leave them confused and lacking conviction. Doubt seems to have replaced patriotism as a virtue to be inculcated.”

— Linda Chavez
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

“The proposal for a separation of school and state, though based upon traditional American values of pluralism, individual liberty, and family responsibility, is controversial. Though very few opponents of a separation between religion and government can be found in the U.S., there are many who regard similar protection for secular pluralism and freedom of conscience in schools unacceptable. To some, the proposal is unacceptable because it appears to threaten vested interests like teachers' working conditions, pay, and academic freedom, or the professional influence and status of school administrators, schools of education, and unions...”

— Stephen Arons
University of Massachusetts

“Teachers are not alone in suffering the consequences of relaxed disciplinary standards. Poor discipline is taking a heavy toll on every aspect of public education. Teachers and administrators pay by risking their personal safety. Taxpayers pay by footing the bill for vandalism and the countless other costs related to school crime. But the highest price is exacted from those who can least afford to be short-changed. Students pay, and may continue to pay all their lives, by failing to get the quality education to which they are entitled.”

— Roger Clegg
U.S. Department of Justice

Published by Regnery Gateway for the Free Congress Research and Education Foundation.

ISBN: 0-89526-823-X